Indian Religious Historiography

1777

N. N. BHATTACHARYYA

To
My esteemed friends
Krishna Mohan Shrimali
and
Vivekananda Jha

ISBN 81-215-0636-0 (for the set)
ISBN 81-215-0637-9 (for vol. I)

First published 1996
©1996, **Bhattacharyya**, Narendra Nath

Typeset, printed and published by
Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.,
Post Box 5715, 54 Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi 110 055.

Contents

Preface ix

CHAPTER 1
Studies on Prehistoric and Tribal Religious Structure 1

CHAPTER 2
Studies on the Vedic Religion 27

CHAPTER 3
Studies on Buddhism 92

CHAPTER 4
Studies on Jainism 158

CHAPTER 5
Studies on the Epics, Bhagavadgītā and Purāṇas 196

CHAPTER 6
Works Bearing on Religious History—Diverse Approaches 240

CHAPTER 7
Studies on the Theistic Sects and Miscellaneous Cults 271

CHAPTER 8
Iconographical and Terminological Studies 340

Bibliography 375

Index 383

CHAPTER 1

Studies on Prehistoric and Tribal Religious Structure

The precise nature of the religious structure of prehistoric and protohistoric India is a question which the internal archaeological evidence is in itself too fragmentary to solve. Although as early as in 1863 the foundation of prehistoric studies was laid by R. Bruce Foote,[1] prior to the dramatic discovery of Mohenjo-daro in 1922 there was no sincere attempt to delve into the prehistoric and protohistoric cultures from a purely archaeological point of view. From the last quarter of the nineteenth century, to the thirties of the twentieth the emphasis of the 'official' archaeologists was on the historical monuments. In fact, archaeology in India was evolved without any specific sophisticated theoretical foundation and the prehistory of this subcontinent is still at a stage in which the establishment of chronological and sequential relationship between sites and regions has not been fully possible.

The study of the prehistoric religion of India was initiated by the nineteenth-century scholars who were greatly influenced by the evolutionist anthropological approach, one of the main drives of which was to seek the 'origins' of various institutions, ideas, beliefs and customs. Evolution of culture appeared to them as a continuous process. They held that the beliefs and ideals of different civilizations were often formulated in their religious rituals more explicitly than in other culture traits, and this fact had given to the

[1]For an outline of the genesis and progress of prehistoric studies in India see R.B.Foote, *The Foote Collection of Indian Prehistoric and Protohistoric Antiquities: Notes on Ages and Distribution*, Madras, 1916; J. Coggin Brown, *Catalogue of Prehistoric Antiquities in the Indian Museum*, Simla, 1917; H.C. Dasgupta, 'Bibliography of Prehistoric Indian Antiquities', in *JASB*, XXVII, Calcutta, 1931; A. Ghosh, 'Prehistoric Explorations in India', in *IHQ*, XXIV, 1948, 1–18; V.D. Krishnaswami, 'Progress in Prehistory', in *Ancient India*, IX, 1952, 53–79; B.B. Lal, *Indian Archaeology Since Independence*, New Delhi, 1964; V.N. Misra, 'Prehistory in India', in *Review of Indological Research in Last 75 years*, ed. by P.J. Chinmulgund and V.V. Mirashi, Poona, 1967, 351–415; V.N. Misra and M. Nagar, 'Twentyfive Years of Indian Prehistory (1947–72): A Review of Research', in *Man and Society*, ed. by K.S. Mathur and S. Varma, Lucknow, 1973, 1–54; Dilip K. Chakravarti, *A History of Indian Archaeology*, New Delhi, 1988.

study of religion a deeper historical significance. Very frequently the knowledge of the cause of a certain custom found among one people helps to understand the meaning of the same, or more or less similar, customs among other peoples. A comparison of the circumstances in which a custom is practised by different peoples must lead to the discovery of the motive underlying it. If one can show that a particular ritual or custom also exists elsewhere, detect the motives which led to its institution, prove that these motives operate widely producing in varied circumstances a variety of institutions specifically different but generically alike, and point out that these motives, with some of its derivative institutions were actually at work in prehistoric days and are still surviving among the backward societies of modern times, then one may fairly infer from the prevalence of a ritual on custom or institution, or from facts interpreted as survivals of it, that this custom or institution is a relic from a stage of development which the whole human race went through.[2]

There is also another point in the evolutionary approach. Similar rituals are often found among peoples widely separated from each other and not known to be of the same stock. Sometimes it is regarded as a proof of blood relationship, or of intercourse, direct or indirect. According to the *Kulturkraise* theory developed by Frobenius, Graebner and Schmidt, wherever a sufficient number of independent analogous forms are found in remote areas, these should be considered as definite proof of an early historic connection. But there is another school which ascribes the similarity to the like working of man's mind under like conditions. The differences in the culture and behaviour of various races of mankind are believed to be rather differences of development than of origin, rather of degree than of kind. The most important thing which one is to consider is that, in spite of all racial and individual differences, the mental constitution of man is similar everywhere which is built upon a foundation common to all forms of life.[3]

[2]J.G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, London, 1907–15, V. 233–35, 263–76, VI. 33–38, 236–52, VII. 14–34, 168–70, VIII. 325–29, IX. 394–96; E.B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, London, 1871, II. 277–328; R.R. Marett, *The Threshold of Religion*, London, 1914, 80–81; J.E. Harrison, *Ancient Art and Ritual*, Cambridge, 1913, 29–118, 204–52.

[3]E.B. Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, London, 1865, 5, 361 ff.; Graebner, *Methode der Ethnology*, Heidelberg, 1911, 108ff.; E. Westermarck, *History of Human Marriage*, London, 1921, I. 17.

This evolutionist anthropological approach also formed the basis of the study of Indian prehistoric and tribal cultures. As early as in 1872, W.W. Hunter observed that India was as if an ethonological museum in which mankind could be studied successively from the lowest to the highest cultural grade. In 1893, G. Oppert had categorically stated that Vedism and Brahmanism must have absorbed much of the religious beliefs and practices, usages and traditions, of the so called pre-Aryan peoples, the original inhabitants of India, and that the facts about the backward tribes of the past, as is described in the ancient literary sources of India, did not differ very much from those of the surviving tribes whose progress had been retarded under diverse historical conditions. This approach was shared alike by other scholars who insisted that, owing to the paucity of archaeological materials (apart from a few megaliths nothing was known till then), the internal evidence (i.e., what was obtained from literary sources) should be studied in the light of what was known of the surviving tribal institutions in general.

Indian historiography in the modern sense was initiated by the British rulers and it was predominantly characterised by imperialistic and prejudiced outlook. It began with James Mill and was later enriched by a host of historians of whom V.A. Smith was the typical representative. To them "the autocratic king, oppressive and unconcerned with the welfare of his subjects, was the standard image of the Indian ruler. . . . As for actual governing, the underlying assumption was that British administration was in fact superior to any other known to the history of this subcontinent".[4] So far as the study of religion was concerned, their approach varied from time to time and was motivated by a variety of purposes. The basic approach was that India was a land of superstition; people propitiated crude and false gods with ghastly rites; and morality had no place in their religious systems. Indians in general, and Hindus in particular, were considered as beastly savages. Even Sir William Jones was ridiculed when he said that the Hindus had attained a high state of civilisation.[5] Sir Thomas Munro made the following observation in 1817: "Foreign conquerors have treated the natives with violence,

[4]Romila Thapar, *History of India*, Harmondsworth, 17.

[5]*Private Journal of the Marquess of Hastings*, 17; J.S. Mill, *Considerations of Representative Government*, XVII, 113; F.J. Shore, *Notes on Indian Affairs*, 2 vols., London, 1837; J. Challey, *Administrative Problems of British India*, London, 1910, 192; etc.

but none has treated them with so much scorn as we; none have stigmatised the whole people as unworthy of trust, as incapable of honesty, and as fit to be employed only where we cannot do without them. It seems not only ungenerous, but impolitic, to debase the character of a people fallen under our dominion."[6]

One of the factors behind this contemptuous attitude, especially towards the religious life of the Hindus, which developed among the Europeans in general and the Britishers in particular, was the horrible reports sent by the European Christian missionaries for extracting more money for their own luxury from the central authorities in the name of civilising a barbarous people with the magic touch of Christianity, which was then an impossible task. When Zeigenbalg wanted to convert the upper classes of the Hindus by argument he failed miserably. "In a notable debate held under the auspices of the Dutch in Negapatam, Ziegenbalg disputed with a Brahmin for five hours and far from converting the Brahmin, the missionary came away with an excessive admiration for the intellectual gifts of his adversary."[7] Wise Europeans understood that Christianity had nothing to teach Hinduism. Even a zealous missionary like W. Ward[8], who wrote two volumes on the Hindus as early as in 1818 notwithstanding his prejudices, had to admit of the strange capability of Hinduism to survive and flourish under most adverse conditions. Abbe Dubois wrote at the end of the eighteenth century in his *Letters on the State of Christianity in India* that under the existing circumstances there was no human possibility of so overcoming the invincible barrier of Brahmanical prejudice as to convert the Hindus as a nation to any sect of Christianity.[9] He also spoke highly, unlike his European contemporaries, about the excellence of the Hindu social organisation.[10] Subsequently the Christian missionaries laid more emphasis on the conversion of the tribes. Glimpses of the tribal life of India, which

[6]Quoted in G.T. Garratt, *An Indian Commentary*, London, 1928, 398–99.

[7]P. Thomas, *Christians and Christianity in India and Pakistan*, London, 1954, 153–54.

[8]*A View of the History, Literature and Mythology of the Hindoos*, 2 vols., Serampore, 1818.

[9]*Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, VIII, 624.

[10]His *Description of the Character, Manners and Customs of the People of India* was purchased and printed by the East India Company in 1816. His *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies*, Oxford, 1906, was from the French Original *Moeurs institutions et Cérémonies des peoples de l'Inde* first published in 1825.

were published by the missionaries working among them provided the original source-materials of anthropological studies in which the English officials and settlers in India later became increasingly interested.

After the establishment of British rule in India, there was another change in the approach towards religious studies. Scholarly emphasis was laid upon what was then known as Orientalism of which the study of Indology was a part. British Orientalism, as David Kopf has tried to show, was to a great extent politically motivated, intended for impressing upon the mind of the educated Indians that their sympathetic rulers were keen on making their subject-peoples self-conscious by bringing to light the forgotten chapters of their cultural heritage. This gave them enough political dividend.[11] This does not, however, mean that those who studied various aspects of the ancient culture and civilisation of India, those who learnt Sanskrit, Pali and other ancient languages, edited, translated and published the ancient religious texts and opened new horizons in this branch of study, were all politically motivated. Still one has to admit that consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, they reflected the spirit of a political approach of the alien rulers which was aimed at gaining the goodwill of the subject-peoples. At the same time the British historians popularised the concept of Aryanism and the legend that just as in the past the Aryans left their homeland with a civilising mission, so also, their modern counterparts, the Britishers, had a similar mission to be accomplished with the help of their Aryan brethren and collaborators of India.

It cannot, however, be denied that, notwithstanding all political motivations, the efforts of the Indologists and anthropologists yielded some tangible results which could be applied to the understanding of the prehistoric conditions as well. It was established that tribal ingredients, even of the most primitive kind, were still in force in the structural set up and functional role of the subsequent social developments like the caste system as also in the institutions like the village communities, customary laws, folk religions, popular beliefs and rituals, oral traditions, etc. A vast mass of anthropological literature including correspondences, notes and

[11]D. Kopf, *British Orientalism and Bengal Renaissance*, Berkeley, 1969; cf. J.H. Broomfield, *Elite Conflict in a Plural Society*, Berkeley, 1962; R. Blackburn ed., *Explosion in a Subcontinent*, Harmondsworth, 1975.

queries,[12] gazetteers,[13] memoirs, journals, census reports,[14] surveys and researches on tribes and castes,[15] monographs on religious and kindred topics came into existence between the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century. These works contained first hand information on various aspects of popular and tribal life and were utilised by scholars in diverse fields of specialised study. A good number of works on tribal and popular religions were published side by side with the enormous publications on the so called 'higher religions' like Vedism, Buddhism or

[12]Cf. *North Indian Notes and Queries*, 5 vols., Allahabad, 1891–95; *Punjab Notes and Queries*, 4 vols., Allahabad, 1885–87; etc.

[13]B.C. Allen, *Sylhet*, Calcutta, 1905; E.T. Atkinson, *Himalayan Districts*, 3 vols.; Allahabad, 1882–86; L.F. Beglei and A.E. Nelson, *Chanda*, Allahabad, 1909; J.M. Campbell, *Bombay*, 27 vols., Bombay, 1874–1904; A.P. Cox and H.A. Stuart, *North Arcot*, 2 vols., Madras, 1893; K.D. Erskine, *Rajaputana*, 4 vols., Allahabad, 1908–09; W. Francis, *Vizagapatnam*, Madras, 1909; L.S.S. O'Malley, *Bengal Districts*, Calcutta, 1913; P.R. Hemingway, *Trichinopoly*, Madras, 1907; A.C. Lyall, *Berar*, Bombay, 1870; M.M. Din, *Bahawalpur*, Lahore, 1909; *Muzaffargarh*, Lahore, 1884; A.E. Nelson, *Bilaspur, Jubbalpore, Raipur*, Allahabad, 1909–10; R.V. Russell, *Betul, Bhandara, Damoh, Chhindwara, Nagpur, Nimar, Saugor, Seoni, Wardha*, 1906–08; etc. The celebrated *Imperial Gazetteer of India* was published from Oxford in 27 vols., 1907–09.

[14]D.C. Baillie, *North Western Provinces and Oudh*, Allahabad, 1894, R. Burn, Allahabad, 1902; D. Bray, *Baluchistan*, Calcutta, 1913; J. Dalal, *Baroda*, Bombay, 1902; G.H. Desai, Bombay, 1911; R.E. Enthoven, *Bombay*, 1902; P.J. Mead and G.I. Macgregor, 1912; E.A. Gait, *Assam*, Shillong, 1892; E.A. Gait, *Bengal*, Calcutta, 1902; E.B. Maclagan, *Punjab*, 1892; H.K. Kaul, 1912; S.H. Healy, *Ajmer-Marwara*, 1913; R.A. Rose, *North West Frontier Province*, 1902; C. Latimer, 1912; R.V. Russell, *Central Provinces and Berar*, Nagpur, 1902; J.T. Martin, Calcutta, 1912; N.S. Aiyar, *Travancore*, Trivandrum, 1903; etc.

[15]L.K.A.K. Iyer, *The Cochin Tribes and Castes*, 2 vols., Madras, 1909–12; G.W. Briggs, *The Chamars*, Oxford, 1920; W. Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of the North Western Provinces and Oudh*, 4 vols., Calcutta, 1896; E.T. Dalton, *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1872; S. Endle, *The Kacharis*, London, 1911; R.E. Enthoven, *Tribes and Castes of Bombay*, 3 vols., Bombay, 1920–22; P.R.T. Gurdon, *The Khasis*, London, 1914; T.C. Hodson, *The Meithis*, London, 1908; *The Naga Tribes of Manipur*, London, 1911; J.H. Hutton, *The Angami Nagas*, London, 1921; *The Sema Nagas*, London, 1921; D.C.J. Ibbetson, *Punjab Ethnography*, Calcutta, 1883; C.E. Luard, *The Ethnographic Survey of Central India*, Indore, 1909; J.P. Mills, *The Lhota Nagas*, London, 1922; A. Playfair, *The Garos*, London, 1909; H.H. Risley, *The Tribes and Castes in Bengal*, 2 vols., Calcutta, 1891–92; *The Peoples of India*, London, 1915; W.H.R. Rivers, *The Todas*, London, 1906; G.S. Robertson, *The Kafirs of Hindukush*, London, 1906; H.A. Rose, *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Pubjab and North Western Provinces*, 3 vols., Lahore, 1912–19; H.V. Nanjundayya and L.K.A.K. Iyer, *The Mysore Tribes and Castes*, Mysore, 1928–35; R.V. Russell and Hira Lal, *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces*, 4 vols., London,

Jainism, and this provided a scope for comparative study of the two main streams which characterised the Indian religious phenomena as a whole.[16]

The early writers on popular and tribal religious systems of India were thoroughly guided by the evolutionist approach of the anthropologists and wanted to seek the origin of religious beliefs and practices from single unilinear fundamentals. Some of the well known theories were utilised by them to explain the Indian situations. Special emphasis was laid upon E.B. Tylor's Animism, according to which religion had its origin in the attempt of man to establish a relationship between him and certain of the spirits with which the world around him were peopled, and this would lead him to seek to propitiate the powerful spirits and to exorcise the evil ones. The Ghost-theory of Herbert Spencer which finds the origin of religion in the worship of ancestors appearing in the form of ghosts was also taken into account. Totemism, in which a species of animal or plant, or more rarely a class of inanimate objects, to which a social group or a clan stands in an intimate relationship, was likewise favoured. The concept of Mana, an all-pervading super-sensual power or influence that operates in unexpected ways or appears in natural objects of striking character, was not even overlooked. The theory of Magic which sought to explain the origin of religion in the application of the laws of the association of ideas, especially the laws of association by similarity and

1916; S.C. Roy, *The Mundas*, Calcutta, 1912; *The Oraons*, Ranchi, 1915; J. Shakespear, *The Lushai Kuki Clans*, London, 1912; E. Stack, *The Mikirs*, London, 1908; E. Thurston and K. Rangachari, *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*, 7 vols., Madras, 1909; etc.

[16]Among such specialised works mention may be made of J.M. Campbell's *Notes on the Spirit Basis of Belief and Custom*, Bombay, 1885; W. Crooke's *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, London, 1896; *Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, London, 1926; H. Whitehead's *Village Gods of South India*, Calcutta, 1916; E. Thurston's *Omens and Superstitions of Southern India*, London, 1912; B.A. Gupte's *Hindu Holidays and Ceremonials*, Calcutta, 1910; M.M. Underhill's *Hindu Religious Year*, Calcutta, 1921; S.M. Natesa Sastri's *Hindu Feasts and Ceremonials*, Madras, 1903; J.C. Oman's *The Brahmans, Theists and Muslims of India*, London, 1907; G. Oppert's *Original Inhabitants of India*, Westminster, 1893; J.E. Padfield's *The Hindu at Home*, Madras, 1896; C.H. Buck, *Faiths, Fairs and Festivals of India*, Calcutta, 1917; S.C. Bose, *The Hindus as They Are*, London, 1881; J.C. Oman, *Indian Life: Religious and Social*, London, 1879; G.K. Ray Chaudhuri, *Hindu Customs and Manners*, Calcutta, 1888; W.T. Elmore, *Dravidian Gods in Modern Hinduism*, Nebraska, 1915; B.K. Sarkar and R.K. Rakshit, *Folk Elements in Hindu Culture*, London, 1917; etc.

contiguity in space and time, was also eagerly accepted by scholars working on the field of Indian religious systems.[17]

The propounders of these theories erred in assuming a single unilinear evolution discovered by means of the study of examples collected at random from all parts of the world. They also erred in placing every existing primitive and advanced culture in a single ascending line. Subsequently, however, the evolutionist approach was abandoned or given diminishing importance by the greater section of the western anthropologists. In 1912, Emile Durkheim insisted that the study of religion should concentrate more upon the social significance of religious beliefs and experiences. Though he belonged to the evolutionist school, and many of his formulations subsequently outdated, to a certain extent his views were able to influence, in the Indian context those of Marcel Mauss, Henri Hubert, G. Held, Georges Dumezil, P. Messon-Oursel and others. Max Weber (1864–1920) in his numerous works attempted to lay foundations of the sociology of religion by trying to establish links between specific social stratum distinctions and modes of religious expression. In 1926 Malinowsky declared that the task of social anthropology should be aimed at the understanding of the nature of culture that at conjectural reconstructions of its evolution or of past events. It should be aimed at the explanation of anthropological facts at all levels of development by their function, by the part which they play within the integral system of culture, by the manner in which they are related to each other within the system and by the manner in which this system is related to the physical surroundings. Following Malinowsky, Radcliffe Brown also defined a social system as consisting of "the total social structure of society together with the totality of social usages in which that structure appears and on which it depends for its continued existence". As his theory developed, he laid increasing stress on the comparative

[17]For the evolutionist anthropological theories see, E.B. Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, London, 1871; M. Jastrow, *The Study of Religion*, London, 1901; F.B. Jevons, *An Introduction to the History of Religion*, London, 1896; E. Durkheim, *Les Formes Elementaries de la vie Religieuse*, Paris, 1912, Eng. trans., London, 1915; A. Lang, *Making of Religion*, London, 1898; J.G. Frazer, *The Magic Art*, G.B., I, London, 1911; R.R. Marrett, *The Threshold of Religion*, London, 1900; E.S. Hartland, *Ritual and Belief*, London, 1914; etc. Freud and subsequently Jung opened up psychological approach to the study of religion and this approach had direct or indirect impact on the writings of H. Zimmer, J. Campbell, W.D. O'Flaherty and others who chose to penetrate various topics pertaining to Indian and oriental religious infrastructure.

analysis of social structures as the primary aim of social anthropology. Claiming social anthropology to be a natural science of society to which the conjectural history resorted to by the older anthropologists was irrelevant, he sought to establish general tendencies or laws underlying the diversities of human social life.

Although the conjectural reconstruction of the past through the study of the surviving cultures is not now encouraged by the anthropologists, the theoretical formulations of the evolutionist school, notwithstanding their one-sidedness, were able to throw significant light on the most primitive substratum of religion, especially in the case of India where primitive conditions still survive side by side with the modern. Indeed, a predominantly agricultural country like India with her stunted economic development accounting for the strong survival of tribal elements is only likely to be full of such relics in the field of religion as may satisfactorily be explained in terms of the theoretical formulations like animism, magic, totemism, etc. which were supposed to constitute the infrastructure of what was later known as religion. Early scholars who worked on Indian popular and tribal cults found it difficult to distinguish between animism and lower forms of Hinduism. They found that many tribes preferred to call themselves Hindus and outwardly conformed to Hinduism by worshipping themselves some of the Brahmanical deities without giving up their traditional beliefs and practices. Side by side the local, village, caste or tribal godlings occasionally received worship from all section of the Hindus when some crisis occurred. They found that it was not possible to draw a clear line of distinction between the beliefs and practices of the tribes and those of the peasantry of the plains. The theory of detribalisation appealed them most. Their conclusion was that the Indian villagers following agricultural and other caste-professions were really detribalised peoples who on the one hand retained their traditional beliefs and practices, the legacies of remote antiquity , and on the other hand had continually been subjected to the cultural influence of the more advanced.

This approach seems to be valid, but they erred in certain cases. Those who worked in the field of tribal and popular religious systems were more eager to find their own favourite theoretical preoccupations than to study the systems as a whole. For example, guided by the assumption that the cult of the Female principle must have been originated in a female dominated society, they sought to

trace matriarchy among the Khasis of Meghalaya quite ignoring the fact that, notwithstanding the existence of matrilineal descent and inheritance and also matrilocal marriage among them, the authority was wielded by the males in their society. Secondly, in regard to the evolution of religious ideas they were guided by oversimplified notions. Owing to their Christian bias (and in the case of Indian writers the Brahmo and neo-Hindu bias) they thought that monotheism was the final word of all forms of religious evolution and that it was the culmination of a prolonged process leading to the development from crude and primitive ideas of divination to the more refined concept of a Supreme Being controlling the universe. But it was not so. Even in the heydays of the evolutionist school A. Lang, F. Graebner and P.W. Schmidt had shown that monotheism was frequently present as the only; or the prevalent, form of religion among the earliest or most simple peoples; this also held good in the case of the surviving and ancient tribes and castes of India. While dealing with the complexities and encumbrances of magic, animism, fetischism, totemism and the like or the exuberance of polytheism of Indian life scholars with the evolutionist approach failed to realise that the religion of the simpler peoples might have been as complex and sophisticated as that of the civilised. Thirdly, it had almost become a fashion among them to associate various cults, beliefs and practices with different racial and linguistic groups and their migrations. They were guided by the theory of diffusionism which was concerned with finding the various complexes or types of culture to which every known culture could be reduced or from which it originated.

Although there is no necessary and invariable concomitance between race and language on the one hand and religious beliefs and practices on the other, there was no lack if scholarly enthusiasm and exercises to view the latter in terms of the former. It has not been established that a particular racial type must necessarily or inevitably have its mental and emotional outlook pre-decided and that there is an ineradicable racial character. As B.S. Guha has categorically stated in regard to the racial distribution of India as a whole: "It must be clearly understood that no rigid separation is possible as there is considerable overlapping of types."[18] Moreover, the study of the races of India was always politically motivated,

[18]B.S. Guha, *Racial Element in Population*, Oxford Pamphlets on Indian Affairs no. 22, Bombay, 1944, 26.

made quite arbitrarily by British Officials with insufficient data and immature outlook. For example, in the seven racial types formulated by Sir Herbert Risley in the *Census Report* for 1901, four were regarded as belonging to the Dravidian 'races'. The concept 'Dravidian' at one time meant anything that was not 'Aryan' and it was equated with all the 'superstitious' and 'vulgar' aspects of the Hindu way of life while the 'brighter' aspects were characterised as 'Aryan'. In the *Census Report* of 1871 only 16 million among the peoples of India were counted as belonging to the 'Aryan' stock, while the rest was described as the 'aboriginal' and 'semi-civilised' racial groups of Dravidian 'origin'. Notwithstanding the identification of the Dravidian as a distinct speech-family as early as in 1856 by Bishop Caldwell, the pure linguistic definition took a long time to get recognised. Even in Hutton's *Census Report* of 1931, the term Dravidian was continued to have been used to denote the black-skinned medium-statured, leptorrhine dolichocephals of inferior racial status.

Although it can not be determined whether a prehistoric religious concept had its origin among a particular racial group, it is more or less certain that such a concept might have found an expression in the language of that body of men. Although from a logical point of view a language has nothing to do with a race—since one language may be spoken by a number of races or one race may speak in different languages—it is also a fact that, though by no means determined by a race, yet at the beginning every natural language must have been confined within a not too large racial group. That is why racial and linguistic studies were never completely divorced. However, it has now been established that, notwithstanding their various racial affinities, the peoples of India belong to one or the other of the four distinct ancient speech-families, viz., the Austric, the Tibeto-Chinese or Sino-Tibetan, the Dravidian and the Indo-European. Studies in these ancient speech-families have yielded copious cultural data, very often pertaining to religious beliefs and practices, and these have been immensely helpful to understand the prehistoric substratum of Indian religion.

The Sino-Tibetan speakers touched only the fringe of India in the north and the north-east and their influence was not so singificant as that of the speakers of the Austric, Dravidian and the Indo-European. Studies in the Austric speech family was initiated

by Pater F. Schmidt and it was followed by William Hevesy, Sylvain Lévi, Jean Przyłusky, Jules Bloch, K.B.J. Kuiper, C. Regamy, B. Bonnerjea, S.C. Roy, S.K. Chatterji and others. At present Austric dialects belonging to the Kol or Munda group are spoken on the soil of India and one speech of the Mon-Khmer group is current among the Khasis of Meghalaya. From the survival of the Austric words in different Indian languages it has been suggested that some beliefs like the notions of future life after death, some ritualistic practices like the use of betel vine, turmeric or vermilion, some magico-religious rituals like the removal of evil eye, some mythological concepts like the creation of the world from an egg, the idea of taboo, the enumeration of the days by the phases of the moon (cf. *rākā* or full moon and *kuhū* or new moon of the *Ṛgveda* and the *mātṛkā* constellation), the animal incarnation of God, the cult of *liṅga* or phallus, the concept of the *nāgas* as serpent spirits, etc. are of Austric origin.[19] But it should be remembered that mere presence of certain religious concepts or beliefs or practice in an ancient speech does not mean that these were generated and developed exclusively among its speakers.

After the publication of Caldwell's *Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Language* in 1856, it took a long time to prove that the term Dravidian was inapplicable to any, specific race, that the Dravidian speeches of the present day stand apart as a group by themselves and that they were at one time fairly widespread in the whole of India when it was agreed that the Brahui area in Baluchistan was just a surviving fragment of a widespread Dravidian tract. The survival of Dravidian vocables in the place-names of northern India, the presence of Dravidian words in Sanskrit language and the conspicuousness of Dravidian elements in the Hindu religion, mythology, philosophy, ritualism and architecture could hardly be ignored by the scholars. P.T. Srinivasa Iyengar's survey of the early Dravidian culture on the basis of the primitive Dravidian words in Old Tamil provided a genuine key for unlocking the potentialities

[19]S. Lévi, J. Przyluski and J. Bloch, *Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India*, Eng. trans. by P.C. Bagchi, Calcutta, 1919; C. Regamy in *Bulletin de l'Ecole francaise de l'Extreme-Orient*, XXXIV, 1935, 429–566; B. Bonnerjea in *Indian Culture*, 1937, 621–32; S.C. Roy, *The Mundas and their Country*, Calcutta, 1912; *The Oraons of Chotanagpur*, Ranchi, 1915; *Oraon Religion and Customs*, Ranchi, 1928; F.B.J. Kuiper, *Austro-Asiatic Words in Sanskrit*, London, 1950; S.K. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, Calcutta, 1969, 31–35; W.G. Griffith, *Kol Tribes of Central India*, Calcutta.

of pre-Aryan studies.[20] Philologists went one step further to prove that like the Aryans the early Dravidians too had their homeland in the Aegean region whence they migrated in different directions with a civilising mission, that before the coming of the Aryans they had Dravidised the whole of northern India (though after the arrival of the Aryans the whole of northern India, barring a few pockets, went out of their hand) and in the present-day texture of the Indian culture the warp appears to be Dravidian and the weft Aryan. Such ideas became more popular when the Harappa civilisation was also claimed to have been of Dravidian origin.[21] It was suggested on the basis of the Harappan evidence that the Dravidians had a conception of the forces of life and the universe in the form of a great Mother Goddess and her male counterpart a Father God—which they brought to India from their original homeland in the Aegean—serving as the base on which the Śiva-Umā cult grew up in Hinduism. It was also suggested that temple worship, the doctrines of transmigration and metempsychosis, cult of zoomorphic deities, tree worship, the system of *pūjā* by offering fruits, leaves and flowers and many other features of Hinduism were of purely Dravidian origin.

After the discovery of the Harappa civilisation in 1921–22 there was a dramatic change in the approach towards Indian religion and culture. It opened a new horizon in the field of prehistoric studies in which greatest emphasis was laid upon the pre-Vedic and non-Vedic elements. As early as in 1893, Gustav Oppert drew the attention of the scholars to the non-Vedic and pre-Vedic elements which he considered to be the major constituents of Hinduism. In 1901, Herman Jacobi, while dealing with Jainism came to the conclusion from internal literary evidences that it goes back to a very early period and to primitive currents of religion and metaphysical speculation which gave rise to the Sāṅkhya and Yoga philosophies on the one hand and to Buddhism on the other. In 1916 R.P. Chanda brought to our notice glimpses of ancient tribal cultures like those of the Śabaras, Barbaras, Kirātas, Niṣādas, Pulindas and

[20]P.T. Srinivasa Iyengar, *Pre-Aryan Tamil Culture*, Madras, 1930. A recent study: M.Deshpande and P.E. Hook eds., *Aryan and Non-Aryan in India*, Ann Arbor, 1979.

[21]S.K. Chatterji was probably the first to put forward this hypothesis in his 'Dravidian Origins and the Beginnings of Indian Civilisation' in *Modern Review*, 1924. It was then followed up by R.D. Banerji in ibid., 1927, 304–14, 552–59, and subsequently by H. Heras (*JIH*, XXI, 23–33) and others.

others from Sanskrit literature.[22] Though pre-Vedic or pre-Aryan origin of many a cult, ritual or idea has been suggested on the basis of indirect textual evidence, it was not until the excavations at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa that actual relics of pre-Vedic religion invested with surprising value came to light.

The basic features of Harappan religion are now known to all. Its outline and interpretation as given by Sir John Marshall have also found general acceptance, Marshall believed in the cultural diffusionist theory outlined above. Referring to the Mother Goddess figurines be observed: "The generally accepted view concerning them is that they represent the Great Mother or Nature Goddess, whose cult is believed to have originated in Anatolia (probably in Phrygia) and spread thence throughout most of Western Asia. The correspondence, however, between these figurines and those found on the banks of the Indus is such that it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the latter also represented Mother or Nature Goddess and served the same purpose as their counterparts in the West, viz., either as votive offerings or, less probably, as cult images for household shrines; and this conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the range of these figurines now extends practically without a break from the Indus to the Nile, over tracts that are not only geographically continuous but which in the Chalcolithic Age were united by common bonds of culture."[23] The same has been echoed by Childe: "The forgotten civilisation must have made

[22]G. Oppert, *Original Inhabitants of India or Bhāratavarsha*, Westminster, 1893; H. Jacobi, *Jain Sūtras, SBE*, Oxford, 1901; R.P. Chanda, *Indo-Aryan Races*, Rajshahi, 1916, rev. ed. by N.N. Bhattacharyya, Calcutta, 1969.

[23]J. Marshall, *Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization*, London, 1931, I, 48ff; cf. V.G. Childe, *What Happened in History*, rev.ed., London, 1957; *New Light on the Most Ancient East*, rev.ed., London, 1954; M.S. Vats, *Excavations at Harappa*, Delhi, 1950; S. Piggott, *Prehistoric India*, London, 1950; M. Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, Cambridge, 1953; E.J.H. Mackay, *The Indus Civilization*, London, 1935; *Further Excavations at Mohenjo-daro*, 2 vols., Delhi, 1938; D.R. Bhandarkar, 'Siva in Prehistoric India', *JISOA*, V, 74–77; H. Heras, 'The Religion of the Mohenjodaro People', *JUB*, V, 1–29; S.S. Sastri, *Proto-Indian Religion*, Bangalore, 1942; O.R. Ehrenfels, *Mother Right in India*, Hyderabad, 1941; etc. Among the more recent publications pertaining to Harappan religion mention should be made of D.D. Kosambi's *Myth and Reality*, Bombay, 1962; H.P. Sullivan's 'A Re-examination of the Religions of the Indus Civilization', in *History of Religion*, IV, 1964; N.N. Bhattacharyya's *Indian Mother Goddess*, 1971, 1977; D. Srinivasan's 'The so-called Proto-Siva seal from Mohenjodaro' in *Archives of Asian Art*, 1976–77; W.A. Fairservis's article in G. Possehl's ed., *Ancient Cities of the Indus*, New Delhi, 1979; I. Puskar's 'Society and Religion in the Indus Valley Civilization' in B. Allchin's ed., *South Asian Archaeology 1981*, Cambridge, 1984; S. Atre's 'Lady of Beasts: The Harappan Goddess' in *Purātattva*, XVI, 1985–86; *The Archetypal Mother*, Pune, 1987; Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Religion and Society*, Bangalore, 1987; etc.

direct if undefinable contributions to the cultural traditions we inherit through Mesopotamia." He also observed that many of the living features of later Hindu religion and philosophy can be traced directly to this pre-Vedic source. They come into view not in the *Ṛgveda*, which represents more or less a pure Indo-Aryan tradition, but either in the later Vedas or in still later Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads, Epics and Purāṇas, when the Vedic people had long since amalgamated with other races and absorbed some measure of their culture.

Marshall's interpretations have largely been inspired by the observations of R.P. Chanda on Śāktism who wrote six years before the discovery of Mohenjo-daro that "for a conception of the godhead analogous to that of the Śākta conception of the Devī we should travel beyond countries dominated by the Vedic Aryans and the Avestic Iranians to Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean".[24] The Mother Goddess figurines, the *liṅga* and *yoni* symbols, scenes on seals and ritual objects present glimpses of some kind of primitive Tantrism. Apart from the yogic posture of the prototype of Śiva found on seals, Chanda had also drawn our attention to a few statuettes from Mohenjo-daro which, according to him, were suggestive of the pre-Vedic origin of yoga. "The only part of the statuettes that is in fair state of preservation, the bust, is characterised by the stiff erect posture of the head, the neck and the chest, and half shut eyes looking fixedly at the tip of the nose. This posture is not met with in the figure sculptures, whether prehistoric or historic, of any people outside India; but this is very conspicuous in the images worshipped by all Indian sects including the Jains and the Buddhists, and is known as the posture of the yogis or one engaged in practising concentration."[25] Likewise the origin of the Sāṅkhya concept of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* had been traced to that of the Female and Male principles of creation as was supposed to exist among the Harappans on the suggestivity of the *yoni* and *liṅga* symbols, the Mother Goddess figures, the male god on the seals and so on. As early as in 1892

[24]*Indo-Aryan Races*, 148–49.

[25]R.P. Chanda, *Survival of the Prehistoric Civilisation of the Indus Valley*, MASI, 41, Calcutta, 1929, 25.

Richard Garbe detected the non-Vedic and anti-Vedic character of the Sāṅkhya. The origin of the Sāṅkhya system appears in the proper light only when we understand that in those regions of India which were little influenced by Brahmanism, the first attempt had been made to explain the riddles of the world and of our existence merely by means of reason. For the Sāṅkhya philosophy is, in its essence, not only atheistic but also inimical to Veda. All appeal to Śruti in the Sāṅkhya texts lying before us are subsequent additions. We may altogether remove the Vedic elements grafted upon the system, and it will not in the least be affected thereby. The Sāṅkhya philosophy had been originally and has remained up to the present day in its real contents, un-Vedic and independent of Brahmanical tradition."[26] S.N. Dasgupta also observed: "It seems, however, pretty certain that Śaṅkara's contention that the Sāṅkhya was non-Vedic is right. The apparent references to Sāṅkya in *Kaṭha* and *Śvetāśvatara* show that these ideas have no organic connection with the general Upaniṣadic scheme of thought."[27]

The hypotheses of Chanda had indeed far-reaching effects on the study of Harappan religion in particular and the pre-Vedic elements on subsequent Hindu religion and society in general. He observed that "Śāktism arose in India under the same social conditions as those under which Astarte was conceived in Syria, Cybele in Asia Minor and Isis in Egypt" and that "the Śākta conception of the Devī, as Ādayā Śakti, 'the primordial energy', and Jagadambā, 'the mother of the universe', also very probably arose in a society where matriarchate or mother-kin was prevalent".[28] Referring to the Harappan Mother Goddesses Marshall echoed the interpretation of Chanda: "That like the Mother Goddesses of Western Asia, they originated in a matriarchal state of society is a highly reasonable supposition".[29] Baron Omar Rolf Ehrenfels went a step further when he said that "these excavations, and Sir John Marshall's summary of their archaeological results, have changed the outlook on the history especially of the more highly developed strata within the matriarchal culture-circle of India, and brought about two fundamentally important facts: (a) The predominance of the pre-

[26]R. Garbe, *Aniruddha's Commentary ... on the Sāṅkhyasūtras*, Calcutta, 1892, XX–XXI; see also *ERE*, XI, 189.

[27]*Indian Culture*, I, 79–80.

[28]R.P. Chanda, *Indo-Aryan Races*, Rajshahi, 1916, 150, 153.

[29]J. Marshall, *Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization*, London, 1931, I, 51.

Aryan element in the cultural structure of what we call 'Hinduism', and (b) the matriarchal character of this advanced pre-Aryan civilisation to which the present-day and medieval India owes so many elements, impulses and cultural moulds".[30] Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya has also emphasised the matriarchal character of the Harappan religion and the pre-Vedic origin of the Tantra and the Sāṅkhya and traced the anomalous position of the *puruṣa* of the Sāṅkhya to the anomalous position of the male in a matriarchal society.[31] The present writer, too, had endorsed the view of Debiprasad in a few of his works.[32]

But, after all, these were all subjective interpretations given an appearance of credibility and objectivity with reference to some ambiguous data juxtaposed from different sources. For example, the thread of matriarchy by which the Harappan religious relics had been interwoven with subsequent forms of Hindu religious beliefs and practices, including the intricacies of the philosophical Sāṅkhya and other doctrines, was in itself defective. True, there are even today social processes and institutions like matrilineal descent, kinship, inheritance, succession, residence, marriage, religious beliefs and practices and so on, but these can hardly be regarded as the vestiges of the earlier universal presence of matriarchy. The cult of a Female Principle may have something to do with a female-dominated society, but there is no inevitable and invariable connection between the two. For example, among the Khasis of Meghalaya, who have a female-dominated society (though the authority is exercised by the males, but in female line), we do not find any special development of the cult of the Mother Goddess. But there are other female-dominated societies in India which have a substantial growth of this cult which also cannot be ignored.

However, after the discovery of the Harappa civilisation it was felt that this civilisation did not fall from the sky. It should have a past as well as a future. That is why attempts were made to explore the pre-Harappan and post-Harappan sites. In 1925 Hargreaves made excavation at Sohr, Rampur, Mastung and Nal at Baluchistan. Its report was published in 1929. In 1926 the Archaeological

[30]O.R. Ehrenfels, *Mother-right in India*, Hyderabad, 1941, I.

[31]Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, *Lokāyata*, New Delhi, 1959, 232–66, 359 ff.

[32]N.N. Bhattacharyya, *Indian Mother Goddess*, 1971 ed., 65–97; 1977 ed., 253–77; *History of the Tantric Religion*, New Delhi, 1982, 158ff.

Department opened an exploration branch. M.A. Stein made extensive exploration in northern and western Baluchistan, the reports of which came out between 1931 and 1939. Stein made some experimental excavations in Periano Ghundai, Moghul Ghundai, Dabar Kot, Kulli, Mehi, Sahi Tump, Sutkagendor and other sites which yielded important results. Explorations and experimental excavations were carried out in Sind by N.G. Majumdar and his report came out in 1934. He discovered the celebrated pre-Harappan site of Amri. In 1935–36 Chanhudaro in the Nawab Shah district of Sind was excavated under the leadership of E. Mackay. The report was published in 1937. These excavations proved that village farming communities existed in Sind and Baluchistan as early as the fourth millennium B.C. and that the original complexion of their assemblages gradually changed to something characteristic of the Indus valley itself. To some extent these cultures appear to coincide with each other in certain phases of development and to overlap in their latest phases with the Harappa culture. Apart from the phallic symbols and terracotta bull figurines, these sites have furnished a fair number of terracotta Mother Goddess figurines. Those from Kulli finish at the waist in a splayed pedestal. In the Zhob valley sites of Dabar Kot, Periano Ghundai, Sur-Jangal, Moghul Ghundai, etc., the same type recurs with necklaces, large and beak-like noses, hooded heads, exaggerated breasts, circular eye-holes and slit mouths. The figurines from Chanhudaro are slightly different from the Mohenjodaro type.[33]

The earlier explorations in Stone Age cultures were made by professional geologists, administrative officers and amateurs who happened to be interested in the subject. In 1935, a team under the auspices of the universities of Yale and Cambridge, led by H. de Terra, T.T. Paterson and T. de Chardin carried out systematic investigation of Ice Age and associated human cultures in Kashmir and Jammu territories, Punjab, Sind, the Narmada valley and Madras. Since then studies in Stone Age cultures were properly channelised and scientific methods of investigation were introduced. The efforts of the last fifty years revealed a reasonable picture in regard to a good number of areas and cultures helping a lot in

[33]H. Hargreaves, *Excavations in Baluchistan*, MASI, 35, 1929, 1–80; M.A. Stein, *An Archaeological Tour in Waziristan and Northern Baluchistan*, MASI, 37, 1929; *An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia*, MASI, 43, 1931; N.G. Majumdar, *Explorations in Sind*, MASI, 48, 1934; E. Mackay, *Further Excavations at Mohenjodaro*, Delhi, 1937.

defining the process of social changes. Early Stone Age began with large assemblages of extremity crude stone implements found practically all over India with the exception of Sind and Kerala. The Middle Stone Age industries, found all over India except Kerala, were mostly based on flakes, corresponding in very general terms to the Levallois-Mousterian industries of Europe and Western Asia. The Late Stone Age of India which was some what technologically comparable to the transitional Mesolithic stage of European prehistory was characterised by microlithic tools of various shapes. No religious relic has been reported of the Early and Middle Stone Ages. The Late Stone Age sites of Panchamarhi in Madhya Pradesh, Lekhahia and Baghai Kor in Uttar Pradesh, Bagor in Rajasthan, Langhnaj in Gujarat and Sarai Nahar Rai in the Ganga-Yamuna Doab have, however, yielded some burials. The crouching posture in which a number of skeletons have been found leaves no doubt that they were deliberately buried with some tender beliefs regarding the fate of the departed ones.[34]

In the Indian context, the Neolithic conditions were rather complex. What Childe called Neolithic Revolution happened only in a limited area which created the preconditions for the rise of Harappa civilisation. But in other parts of this subcontinent, in most cases, the Neolithic and Chalcolithic settlements belonged to the late-Harappan and post-Harappan period. Moreover, there was an admixture of Neolithic and Chalcolithic elements and it is very difficult to make a sharp distinction between the two. Among the few settlements of the unmixed type in which metal is absent, the sites of Meghalaya and Assam have yielded nothing religious. The Neolithic village farming and pastoral communities of Baluchistan and the Indus valley which had a quick transition to the Chalcolithic stage, have, however, yielded terracotta bulls and Mother Goddess figurines, of which mention have been made earlier. Mother Goddess figurines have also been found in Gumla and Hathala in Afghanistan border. In the second phase of the first

[34]For Panchamarhi see G.R. Hunter in *Nagpur University Journal*, 1–2, 1935–37, 31ff.; A. Ghosh in *IHQ*, XXIV, 1948, 14ff.; for Lekhahia see *IAR*, 1964–65; for Baghai Kor, *IAR 1962–63*, 37 ff.; for Bagor, V.N. Misra in *Journal of the University of Poona*, XXXV, 1971, 59–77; for Langhnaj, H.D. Sankalia, *Excavations at Langhnaj*, Poona, 1965; etc. For a general survey from the Stone Age to the post-Harappan cultures see H.D.Sankalia, *Prehistory and Protohistory of India and Pakistan*, Poona, 1974. See also S. Asthana, *Pre-Harappan Culture of India and the Borderlands*, New Delhi, 1985; J. Jacobson, *Studies in the Archaeology of India and Pakistan*, New Delhi, 1986.

period of Burzahom in Kashmir six graves have been found. Some of the skeletons are painted in red which is an indication of the belief in rebirth. Terracotta cult images of snake have been recovered from Chirand in the Saran district of Bihar. Among the southern Neolithic sites mention may be made of Brahmagiri, Sangankallu, Piklihal, Hallur, Gaurimedu, Maski, Nagarjunikonda, Utnur, T. Narsipur, Tekkalkota, etc. These are, however, not of purely unmixed type. Some of these sites have yielded terracotta bull images as well as burials of ritualistic significance. Both systems of complete and partial burials were in vogue. Urn burials have also been found.[35]

Different post-Harappan Chalcolithic phases were observed at the sites at Gujarat, Rajasthan, the Chambal, Narmada and other river basins of Central India, Maharashtra and southern India. The site of Gilund in the Banas valley in Rajasthan have yielded a number of terracotta figurines, a few of which appear to have religious significance. At Nevasa 131 and at Inamgaon 50 burials have been found. Bahal, Chandoli, Daimabad and Sonegaon have also yielded burials. Extended burial was the usual custom. Grave goods have also been found. The storage jars of Navadatoli Phase IV bear small applique figures of males and females, the latter could be regarded as fertility figures or Mother Goddess. Almost identical figures were found at Inamgaon in 1970–71 excavation. The exact significance of the terracotta figurines from Nevasa is not clearly known, but Inamgaon has yielded genuine Mother Goddess figurines. The topmost level of Chirand which belongs to *c.* 1650 BC yielded terracotta figurines. A terracotta female figurine with elevated breast has been found at Uriup in Bihar. At Sonpur post-cremation pit-burial and urn containing human bones have been discovered.[36]

It should, however, be noted in this connection that no specific work on the prehistoric religion of India has yet been done from a

[35]A.H. Dani in *Ancient Pakistan*, V, 1970–71, 1–178; for Burzahom see *IAR 1961–67*; for Chirand L.A. Narain in *JBRS*, LVI, 1970, 1–35; B.S. Verma in *Purātattva*, IV, 1970–71, 18–22; for southern sites see N. Rao and K.C. Malhotra, *Stone Age Hill Dwellers of Tekkalakota*, Poona, 1965; Z.D. Ansari and N. Rao, *Excavation at Sangalkallu*, Poona, 1969; *Report on Hallur Excavation*, Bangalore, 1971; M. Seshadri, *Excavations at T. Narasipur*, Mysore, 1971; R.E.M. Wheeler in *Ancient India*, IV, 1948, 180–310; F.R. Allchin, *Piklihal Excavations*, Hyderabad, 1960, etc.

[36]H.D. Sankalia et al., *Excavations at Ahar*, Poona, 1969; *From History to Prehistory at Nevasa*, Poona, 1959; S.B. Deo, *Sonegaon Excavation*, Poona, 1969; S.B. Deo and Z.D. Ansari, *Chalcolithic Chandoli*, Poona, 1965; Sankalia, Deo and Ansari, *Chalcolithic*

strictly archaeological point of view, except one on the disposal of the dead.[37] It is largely owing to the paucity of materials since, as we have seen above, apart from the Harappan findings, the rest consists of only a few sporadic terracotta figurines of the Mother Goddess and of some animals supposed to be sacred. The graves and the systems of burial also throw some light on religious beliefs. Attempts were made to associate the skeletal remains with different racial types, but very few scholars have come forward to view such correlations in terms of the surviving tribal cultures. There has, however, been some work on the Harappan specimens. The earlier approach was that its ingredients had all come from certain pre-existing types of Western Asia. This approach was based on the diffusionist theory according to which various trends of a given culture had a common origin which could be traced by the process of following the march of the diffused trends back to their sources. Subsequently it was admitted that the Harappan religion had some characteristics of its own which had contributed to the development of certain major tenets of Hinduism of the historical period. This proposition is undoubtedly valid, but more researches are needed to establish it in an evolutionary, uniform and orderly sequence of progress.

Attempts were also made to understand the psychological aspects of the religious and semi-religious beliefs and rituals of prehistoric peoples as well as those of the surviving backward tribes. The archaeologists and the anthropologists mostly subscribe to the view that the material mode of life ordinarily provides the rationale for the cults and rituals. The food-gathering economy (characteristic of the Palaeolithic or Old Stone Age of the archaeologists and Pleistocene of the geologists) provided the sole source of livelihood open to any human society during the major period of its early history. "Before the adoption of agriculture and herding, when a precarious existence was eked out on the chase and edible fruits, roots and berries, the animal and vegetable species which formed his staple diet acquired a sacred character and significance. With this he endeavoured to establish efficacious relations through a prescribed procedure performed by experts in carefully

Navdatoli, Baroda, 1971; M.K. Dhavalikar, 'Some Aspects of the Chalcolithic Cultures of Central India', *Purātattva*, IV, 1970–71; Sankalia, Ansari and Dhavalikar, 'Inamgaon' in *Asian Perspectives*, XIV, 1973, 139–46.

[37]S.P. Gupta, *Disposal of the Dead and Physical Types in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1972.

secluded sanctuaries set apart for the purpose in the awe-inspiring surroundings and conditions calculated to produce a sense of the numinous."[38] In the Indian context, as we have seen above, no information on religious life has been obtained of the Stone Age cultures, except a few interments of the Late Stone Age. Still something may be reconstructed on the basis of the cultural study of the surviving food-gathering tribes like the Aranadans of the Nilambur forest who have given up their rock-shelter habitations only very recently and are still in the food-gathering stage, subsisting on vermins, trapped games, roots and fruits; the Chenchus of the Nallamalais, the Birhors, Koruas and hill-Marhias of the central region who depend mostly on food-gathering and hunting; tribes like the Paniyars of Wynad who now survive as bonded labourers under powerful peasant communities; and tribes like the Muthuvans, Kannikars, Irulas, Sholagas, Malasers, Kadars etc., who have combined food-gathering with slash-and-burn and other forms of primitive agriculture. The need for such a study was stressed long ago by Prof. Nirmal Kumar Bose who had himself provided a guideline of it in a number of articles and also in a book under the title 'The Structure of Hindu Society' which was first written in Bengali and then translated into English posthumously.

The religious beliefs and practices of the food-gatherers were modified according to the new social ideals of the new food-producing economy which could potentially increase the supply to support a growing population. Most Neolithic-Chalcolithic societies buried their dead with still more pomp and social effort then the Old Stone Age hunters. To paint the bones with the ruddy colouring of life, as is found in some skeletal remains of prehistoric India, was the "nearest thing to mummification which the palaeolithic peoples knew; it was an attempt to make the body again serviceable for its owner's use".[39] The colour of blood was treated as the manifestation of life-giving power. "Red is renewal of life. That is why the bones from the upper palaeolithic and neolithic interments are painted red. The symbolism becomes quite clear when we find, as we commonly do, that the skeleton has been laid in the contracted or uterine posture. Smeared with the colour of life, curled up like a babe in the womb. . . . What more could the primitive man do to ensure that the soul of the departed would be

[38]E.O. James, *Prehistoric Religion*, New York, 1957, 174.

[39]R.A.S. Macalister, *Textbook of European Archaeology*, Cambridge, 1921, I, 502.

born again?"[40] In the Neolithic-Chalcolithic phases the approach towards burial was somewhat changed. That the dead so reverently deposited to the earth was supposed somehow to affect the crops that sprang from the earth and was probably brought in relation to the Mother Goddess cult, the Earth Mother thus becoming the guardian of the dead, connected alike with the corpse and the seed-corn beneath the earth. The earth from whose bosom the grains sprout was imagined as a goddess who might be influenced like a woman by entreaties and gifts as well as controlled by imitative rites. The magical rites designed to secure the fertility of the fields seemed to belong to the special competence of the women who were the first cultivators of the soil and whose power of childbearing had, in primitive thought, a sympathetic effect on the vegetative forces of nature. Beliefs and rituals emanating from the primitive concept that natural productivity should be viewed in terms of human productivity, earth-mother in terms of human-mother, are very much current among the agricultural tribes as well as among the peasantry of India which have been traced, identified and documented by the anthropologists and historians of popular religion whose works have been mentioned above.

An economic approach to prehistoric religion, the survival of its ingredients among the existing tribes as also in the religious and philosophical texts of the advanced culture is found in Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya's *Lokāyata* (1959, the Bengali original was published in 1955, and it has been translated into a number of Indian and foreign languages) written from a Marxist point of view. This approach requires a little clarification, before we propose to deal with the aforesaid work. In the beginning of this century R.P. Chanda tried to show that religious beliefs and practices require an objective assessment in which the socio-economic factors should be taken into account. But his inclination towards raciology led him to seek the origins of religious beliefs and practices among various races. In the forties and the fifties Nirmal Kumar Bose (he was well-versed in Marxism, though a Gandhian in his own conviction) in some of his works and Niharranjan Ray in his celebrated *Bāṅgālir Itihās* (in Bengali, 1940) tried to popularise the idea that every economic infrastructure of a given period engenders its own mode of exchange and distribution and builds up its own political,

[40]G. Thomson, *Studies in Ancient Greek Society*, London, 1949, I, 209.

legal, religious and ideological set up. In 1956 D.D. Kosambi asserted that "India showed extraordinary continuity of culture. The violent breaks known to have occurred in the political and theological superstructure have not prevented long survivals of observances that have no sanction in the official Brahmin works, hence can only have originated in the most primitive stages of human society; moreover, the Hindu scriptures, even more the observances sanctified in practice by Brahmanism, show adoption of non-Brahmin local rites. That is, the process of assimilation was mutual, a peculiar characteristic of India".[41] Marxist scholars were also interested in M.N. Srinivas's theory of Sanskritisation which was originally defined as "the adoption of Brahmanic way of life by a low caste" and was subsequently modified as "the process by which a 'low' Hindu caste, or tribal or other group, changes its customs, ritual, ideology and way of life in the direction of a high, and frequently, twice-born caste".[42]

Debiprasad's purpose was to revive and reconstruct the ancient school of Indian materialism, trace its roots into the vast arena of popular cults and rituals, beliefs and practices and identify the class orientation of ideas and institutions and their transformation in different levels of social hierarchy. The term 'Lokāyata' means "what is prevalent among the people". In Indian philosophical tradition it is equated with the materialistic Cārvāka doctrine. Prior to Debiprasad, the Lokāyata or Cārvāka system was handled by many scholars from the philosophical point of view. But it was MM. Haraprasad Sastri who in his two articles, one on the Lokāyatas and the other on the Vrātyas,[43] published in 1925–26, emphasised on the popular ingredients of the Lokāyatas and on the non-Vedic and pre-Vedic elements associated with them. He had also included on the basis of textual information a number of non-Brahmanical religious communities within the Lokāyata tradition and frankly asserted that this tradition, is still alive in our country. Debiprasad's viewpoint was that "Lokāyata meant not only the philosophy of the people but also the philosophy of this worldliness or materialism". The present writer has, however, doubts whether the Cārvāka polemics, especially on the sources of valid

[41] *Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, Bombay, 1956, 20.

[42] M.N. Srinivas, *Religion and Society among the Coorgs of South India*, London, 1952, 30; *Social Changes in Modern India*, Bombay, 1966, 6.

[43] *Dacca University Bulletin*, nos. I and VI.

knowledge, had anything to do with Lokāyata or popular tradition; they seem to be more consistent with the elitist approach. Since here we are concerned more with the prehistoric and tribal elements the following arguments of Debiprasad deserves careful consideration. According to him, from remote antiquity to the medieval times different branches of Indian literature reveal, apart from the Cārvāka philosophy, a different kind of evidence in relation to the Lokāyata which suggests a typical non-conformist spiritual quest flowing from an obscure point of time. This spiritual quest was later channelised under distinctive categories like Āul, Bāul, Sahajiyā, Kāpālika, Tāntrika, etc., although their primitive and subsequent forms are not the same. Since the term Lokāyata has some ambiguity the term Tantra may be used to designate this primitive non-conformist spiritual trend. The later Tantric literature of the Hindus and the Buddhists contain many features of the most-primitive non-conformist religious tradition among which the beliefs and rituals arising out of the equation of earth and woman, of natural and human productivity, are most important. Such primitive beliefs and rituals, in their turn, were responsible for the development of the idea that world was produced in the manner in which human beings came into existence. This world-view was necessarily materialistic in which the human body was conceived as the microcosm of the world.

We have laid special emphasis on this particular book because, although some of its conclusions may not be accepted universally, it has provided new clues for the detection and understanding of that primitive undercurrent which, as a rather suppressed force, has characterised the religious history of India through the ages. Unfortunately very few persons have come forward to proceed with the methodology outlined in this work, the essence of which is that literary sources should be studied in the light of what is known as the tribal survivals which in their turn should be linked with the prehistoric and protohistoric materials. Indian religious historiography has not as yet been able to overcome certain inherent difficulties. Foremost among them is the tendency to study a particular discipline in itself. The prehistorians are thus satisfied with the discovery and classification of their findings without bothering about their suggestivity in terms of historical development and continuity. The anthropologists prefer to be confined in the study of a particular institution as it functions in a given society.

With the decline of the evolutionist approach they have allowed the 'dead past to bury its dead'. Others are engaged in finding facts from texts and inscriptions without caring to understand that there is a difference between a fact and its meaning. This mutual isolation of different brances of study has been a bar to the proper assessment of a religious phenomenon. Apart from these there are problems of prejudices and preoccupations of the writers, certain factors by which their views are circumscribed, the question of the dominant outlook of an age, new-fangled theories, conflicting methodologies, political motivations etc. Some of these will have to be discussed in subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER 2

Studies on the Vedic Religion

I

The foundation of modern studies on the Vedic religion was laid by Sir William Jones who was the first to affirm in 1786 the common origin of a number of languages such as Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, Celtic, Iranian, etc., to which the scholars had given the name Indo-European or Aryan. But it was Henry Thomas Colebrooke who in the year 1805, in one of his remarkable essays 'On the Vedas' presented a definite and reliable information on the earliest sacred books of the Indians. The actual investigation of the Vedas, however, began only in the year 1838 with the edition of the first Eighth of the *Ṛgveda* by Friedrich Rosen. The French orientalist Eugine Burnouf gathered around him a circle of pupils who afterwards became prominent Vedic scholars. One of them was Rudolph Roth who initiated the study of the Vedas in Germany by his book entitled *Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Veda* in 1846. The other was F. Max Müller who made a project of publishing the entire *Ṛgveda* with the commentary of Sāyaṇa. This edition appeared in 1849–75 and its second improved edition in 1890–92.[1]

Notwithstanding Max Müller's warning that the implication of the term 'Aryan' should not go beyond its purely linguistic suggestivity, it was never confined to the exclusive domain of philology. It developed racial, psychological and also political connotation and was used to serve a variety of purposes. The new-fangled concept of Aryanism, indicative of a racial and cultural superiority, created a craze among certain European nations to resort to an Aryan identity

[1]Before the completion of this project Th. Aufrecht published a handy edition of the complete text of the *Ṛgveda* (1861–63). A second improved edition was published in 1890–92. The first translation of the *RV* (in parts) into English was made in 1848 by H.H.E. Roer, a German, who happened to be the librarian of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. A French translation was made in 1848–51 by S.A. Langlois who was a pupil of A.L. Chezy. The history of the beginnings of Vedic research was dealt with by Th. Zachariae in *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1921, 148 ff., an English rendering of which appeared in *Journal of Indian History*, May 1923.

offered to them by the science of comparative philology introduced by Franz Bopp whose works published between 1816 and 1832 presented a thoroughly sober investigation of the languages belonging to the Indo-European family. During this investigation the importance of Sanskrit could not be ignored. In 1821 Wilhelm von Humboldt wrote in a letter to August Wilhelm von Schlegel that "Without as thorough as possible a study of Sanskrit, very little can be accomplished either in philology or in that kind of history which is connected with it". Till the year 1830 it was almost entirely the classical Sanskrit literature which occupied the attention of the European scholars. But since the Vedic texts were the earliest extant Indo-European literary edifies, they were required to be handled by more competent scholars who had already achieved specialisation in Sanskrit and not by those illustrious forerunners who took up Sanskrit to "seek new adventure".

There were numerous problems in regard to the interpretation and translation of the Vedic texts. While some scholars insisted on the Indo-European or Aryan character of the *Ṛgveda*, and hence dependent on comparative studies for interpretation in the light of evidence from outside, especially in that of the suggestivity of comparative philology, other affirmed that the *Ṛgveda* was above all a production of the Indian mind and that for its explanation the Indian tradition should be given the highest preference. So far as this 'Indian tradition' was concerned there were certain problems. The first commentator on the '*Ṛgveda* was Yāska who, on the basis of the existing *Nighaṇṭus* or glossaries of rare and obscure words, explained a good number of Vedic terms and concepts in his *Nirukta* which was composed about 700 BC. Since then no commentarial work on the *Ṛgveda* is known to us except the commentary of Sāyaṇa which was composed in the fourteenth century AD. That is why scholars like Rudolf Roth held that the modern resources of linguistic science were more dependable than the work of a commentator who lived nearly 2500 years after the composition of the *Ṛgveda*. But one should not forget that the commentary of Sāyaṇa explains the *Ṛgveda* word by word, and it could not have been possible for Sāyaṇa unless he was acquainted with a commentarial tradition existing through the ages. Unfortunately works of the predecessors of Sāyaṇa have not as yet come to light. That is why no translator could avoid Sāyaṇa.[2]

[2]H.H. Wilson published a complete English translation of the *RV* in six volumes (1850–57, 1860) which was entirely based upon Sāyaṇa's commentary. Langlois's French translation (1848–51) was reissued in 1872. Alfred Ludwig who belonged to the school of Roth and made a complete German translation of the *RV* in six volumes (1876–88) adding his own commentary to it did not also dismiss Sāyaṇa; rather in his translation it was for the first time that the explanations of Sāyaṇa were thoroughly utilised. H. Grassmann published in two volumes complete metrical translation in German (1876–77) and R.T.H. Griffith in English (1889–92). Selections from the *RV* were translated into English by F. Max Müller and H. Oldenberg in *SBE*, XXXII, XLVI (1891, 1897), E.J. Thomas (1923) and A.A. Macdonell (1925) and into German by K.F. Geldner (1908) and A. Hillebrandt (1913). J. Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts* in five vols. (1858–63) contain excerpts of the relevant passages in original in connection with various topics dealing with religion and other aspects of life along with their English renderings.

W.D. Whitney's statement that "the Vedas appear rather like an Indo-European than an Indian record"[3] was although affirmed by certain Vedic scholars, it did not receive universal acceptance. Rather the general trend was the opposite. The most prominent among the analytical and historical studies on the Vedas in general and the *Ṛgveda* in particular was the *Vedische Studien* in three volumes by R. Pischel and K.F. Geldner which was published from Stuttgart during the years 1889–1901 in which instead of interpreting the *Ṛgveda* in the light of the Indo-European philological findings emphasis was laid on its typical Indian character and its understanding in terms of the Indian literature of later periods. There was another much debated question whether the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were the spontaneous expression of a simple people, the natural outpouring of the hearts of the inspired singers, or whether they were composed by the priests in a workmanlike manner merely with the intention of using them in rituals. While some scholars like A. Kaegi had subscribed to the former view insisting on the simplicity, freshness, delicacy of feeling, boldness of metaphor and the flight of imagination in the poems of the *Ṛgveda*, Oldenberg and others thought that "such poetry could have arisen only in the exclusive circles of the priestly sacrificial experts. Hillebrandt tried to prove that, in a stage earlier than that recorded, the *Ṛgveda* was a definitely practical collection of hymns, arranged according to their connexion with the sacrificial ritual. A third group of scholars like M. Winternitz took a midway position saying that although most of the Ṛgvedic hymns breathed a genuine flavour of primeval poetry at least some of them were used later on for sacrificial purposes. Since the later Saṃhitās contain much of the matter of the *Ṛgveda*, Oldenberg, Bloomfield, Brune and

[3]*Language and Its Study*, London, 1876, 227.

others thought that in these texts might be found traces of the earlier forms of the verses of the *Ṛgveda*, but studies from this point of view have not yielded any tangible result. Likewise Arnold's elaborate attempt to discover the different ages of various portions of the *Ṛgveda*, who has divided the collection into five layers, on a purely hypothetical reconstruction of the metrical history of the hymns has not been a success, and his conclusions have made it impossible to render any intelligible account of the development of Vedic religion.[4] Keith holds that the motive of those to whom the collection called *Ṛgveda* was due must apparently have been the desire to preserve the body of religious tradition current among the priests, that there are clear signs that already some parts of the material had ceased to be fully understood by those who made use of it in their worship and that the certain criteria of age supplied by the language, the metres or the subject-matter of the *Ṛgveda* are not sufficient to justify so elaborate a chronological arrangement of its hymns.[5]

Barring Sten Konow[6] who held "that the conception of Vedic religion as a worship of nature and natural phenomena is fundamentally wrong" most of the earlier scholars agreed that by far the greatest majority of the Vedic gods had proceeded from natural phenomena or natural beings.[7] "In the earlier period of Vedic studies", wrote Macdonell, "there was a tendency to begin research

[4]Cf. A. Kaegi, *Der Ṛgveda*, Leipzig, 1881 (Eng. trans. by R. Arrowsmith, London, 1886); H. Oldenberg, *Hymnen des Ṛgveda*, I, *Metrische und text-geschichtlische Prolegomena*, Berlin, 1888; *Veda forschung*, Stuttgart, 1905; *Die Litteratur des alten Indien*, Berlin, 1903; M. Bloomfield, *Ṛgveda Repetitions*, HOS, XX, XXIV; Brune, *Zur Textkritik der dem Sāmaveda*, etc., Berlin, 1909; A. Hillebrandt, *Veda Interpretation*, Breslau, 1895; E. Windish, *Hymnen des Ṛgveda*, Berlin, 1883; E.V. Arnold, *Vedic Metre*, Cambridge, 1905. For a list of the earlier works on the Vedic texts see L. Renou, *Bibliographie Vedique*, Paris, 1931.

[5]A.B. Keith, *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads*, I, HOS, 1924.

[6]*The Aryan Gods of the Mitani People*, Kristiana, 1921, 5.

[7]Earlier works on Vedic Mythology in general: R. Roth in *ZDMG*, VI, 67–77; H. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Ṛgveda*, Leipzig, 1873, *Ṛgveda*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1876–77; W.D. Whitney, *Oriental and Linguistic Studies*, II, 149 ff.; *JAOS*, III, 291 ff.; 331 ff.; P. Wurm, *Geschichte der indischen Religion*, Basel, 1874, 21–54; A. Ludwig, *Der Ṛgveda*, Leipzig, 1876–88; F. Max Müller, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*, London, 1878; A. Bargaigne, *La Religion Vedique d'apres les Hymnes du Ṛgveda*, 3 vols., Paris, 1878–83; L.V. Schröder, *Indiens Litteratur und Kultur*, Leipzig, 1887, 45–145; Pischel and Geldner, *Vedische Studien*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1889, 1892; A. Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, 3 vols., Breslau, 1891–92; *Die Götter der Ṛgveda*, Breslau, 1894; P. Regnaud, *Le Ṛgveda et les Origines de la mythologie indo-europeenne*, Paris, 1892; E. Hardy, *Die Vedisch-brahmanische Periode der Religion des alten Indiens*, Munster, I.W., 1893; H. Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, Berlin, 1894; A.A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, Strassburg, 1897; M. Bloomfield, *Religion of the Vedas*, New York, 1908.

at the wrong end. The etymological equations of comparative mythology were then made the starting point. These identifications, though now mostly rejected, have continued to influence unduly the interpretation of the mythological creations of the Veda. But even apart from etymological considerations, theories have frequently been based on general impressions rather than on careful sifting of evidence, isolated and secondary traits thus sometimes receiving coordinate weight with what is primary. An unmistakable bias has at the same time shown itself in favour of some one particular principle of interpretation. Thus an unduly large number of mythological figures have been explained as derived from dawn, lighting, sun, or moon respectively. An *a priori* bias of this kind leads to an unconsciously partial utilization of the evidence".[8] The romantic approach of viewing the deities and their legends as spontaneous expression of the natural religion as envisaged earlier by G.J. Hanmann, W. Blake, Schelling and others were sunk into oblivion with the emergence of rationalistic school led by David Hume and his collaborators which received a fresh momentum with a corresponding development of the science of comparative mythology. Adalbert Kuhn believed that just as the Indo-European peoples derived their respective languages from a common Indo-European language, they also derived most of their mythological concepts from a common Indo-European mythology. He also asserted that the etymologies of the names of various Vedic gods provided ample materials for identifying the Indo-European elements in the Vedic mythology.[9] Max Müller was also an ardent exponent of this kind of comparative mythology, the outlines of which were set forth by Kuhn, and he was followed by Gubernatis and Bargaigne. Macdonell, Schroeder, Muir and Bloomfield sought to revive, with critical reservations, the methods of comparative mythology in the study of Vedic religion, but Geldner and

[8]*Vedic Mythology*, 5; cf. Ludwig, *Über Methode bei Interpretation des Ṛgveda*, Prague, 1890; Hillebrandt, *Veda interpretation*, Breslau, 1895.

[9]*Die Herabkunft des Feuers und des Gottertranks*, 1859. *The Mythologische Studien von Adalbert Kuhn* was published posthumously by his son in 1912. Studies pertaining to etymological identifications were also made by Burnouf, Roth, Regnier, Felix Neve and Weber.

Pischel did not favour this idea on the ground that the *Ṛgveda* was predominantly an Indian document. The works of Dmitry Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky of the Russian school on the Vedic cults of Soma (1884) and Agni (1887) were also based on the principles of comparative mythology along with an awareness of its social basis. The folklorists and anthropologists of the evolutionist school also banked on the method of comparative analysis of cultures belonging to different peoples and sought to find 'universal' theories in order to explain the similarities and divergences of the myths and rituals found among races not belonging to the same stock. The ritualistic school led by Jane Harrison, Gilbert Murray, S.H. Hooke and others insisted on interpreting myths in terms of the suggestivity of rituals.

Three periods of the development of Vedic mythology had been suggested on the basis of comparative mythology and philology—Indo-European, Indo-Iranian and Indo-Aryan. Deities like Varuṇa (Ouranos), Dyaus (Zeus), etc. were supposed to belong to the oldest Indo-European category which was believed to have insisted on the worship of nature-gods and a cult of fire. But as Keith has pointed out, "the Indo-European constituents of Greek religion are difficult to detect and have been variously estimated. Roman religion is partly obnoxious to the same defect and partly only known to us at a late date. For Celtic, German, Lettish, Lithuanian and Slavonic religion we are practically dependent on very late sources, and in all these cases again we cannot be sure of what are the Indo-European elements. As a rule, therefore, these religions can serve merely as other non-Indo-European religions serve, as sources of comparison with a view to explaining parallel customs and usages by the operation of the same ideas: they do not enable us to conclude that an Indian usage was actually brought by the Vedic Indians with them into India as part of their own religion. In many cases this was doubtless the case, but lack of conclusive evidence renders it necessary to admit that certainty cannot be obtained. . . . A still more striking case of difficulty of using comparative mythology is afforded by the cult of fire. Among the Greeks Hestia, among the Romans Vesta—and among the Lithuanians Ugnis Szventa seem to have been the object of deep veneration as the goddess of the family hearth. Of this worship we have a parallel in India, where the fire is among other names called the household fire, and where its sanctity is great in the extreme. But

the difference of sex shows that there is a long way between the two conceptions, and suggests that the worship of fire in Indo-European times was animatist rather than anthropomorphic. Similarly, while the worship of the earth is doubtless to be found in every Indo-European form of religion, there is nothing so characteristic of that worship to enable us to ascribe to it any special feature in Indo-European times, and the union of sky and earth is a world-wide myth, which we certainly need not suppose the Indo-Europeans had to borrow from any other source".[10]

Oldenberg's theory that Mitra, Varuṇa and the seven Ādityas of the Vedic pantheon were borrowed from the Semitic religion is not attested by reliable evidence. But an Indo-Iranian period of the Vedic mythology was assumed by the earlier scholars on the basis of the *Avesta*. There can be no denial of the fact that the verses of the *Avesta* often breathe the same religious spirit as those of the *Ṛgveda*. Hillebrandt, Ludwig and Brunnhofer had collected a mass of facts which, even after large deductions for their tendency to theorise, make it probable that some part of the *Ṛgveda* at any rate was the work of poets inhabiting the north Iran from the Caspian Sea to the Punjab. It has also been brought to light through the efforts of competent scholars that the undivided Indo-Iranians knew a Soma cult beside the older fire cult and abstract deities beside the older nature gods and that a large number of common cult-words, and common deities as well as common rituals would amply suggest that the Vedic and Avestan religious concepts were of one and the same origin. The myth of Varuṇa and the whole of the conceptions which are connected with it were elaborately discussed by Darmestater and Hillebrandt. The identifications of Varuṇa with Ahura Mazdah, notwithstanding the objection of Hillebrandt, of Mitra with Mirthra, of the Ādityas with the Amesa Spentas, of Yama with Yima and of other Vedic and Iranian deities have now been generally accepted. Though the name of Indra occurs in the Boghaz-kōi inscription along with Mitra, Varuṇa and the Nāsatyas, in the *Avesta* he is described as a demon; another deity Verethraghna is unmistakably equivalent to Vṛtrahan whose attributes characterise the Vedic Indra. A comparative study of the Vedic and Avestan deities was made by Benveniste who had shown that the Iranian religion, even of the Achaemenian age as described by Herodotus, agreed not at all with that of the Gāthās of

[10] *RPVU*, I, 36–38

Zarathustra but reveals significant points of similarity with the Vedic religion.[11]

Contemporary anthropological ideas, especially the evolutionist formulations as to the origins of religion of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, had influenced the Vedic scholars who tried to explain certain features of the Ṛgvedic religion in terms of certain categories like Theriomorphism, Animatism, Fetishism, Animism, etc. Although reflections of such primitive beliefs are abundantly found in the *Ṛgveda*, the Ṛgvedic mythology is not as primitive as some scholars once believed it to be. The myths that have grown up around a deity are in many cases transparent enough to keep the physical basis almost in full view all the time. There is no fixed order of seniority among the gods, and there is a sort of democracy among them, though it is not thorough-going or consistent. This situation has been characterised by Max Müller as Henotheism which implies 'the belief in individual gods alternately regarded as the highest'. It has been urged that the inconsistency, may be due to the partiality of a particular *ṛṣi* or Vedic Śākhā to a particular god. But as Bloomfield has rightly observed: "No theory as to the character and origin of the *Ṛgveda* can pass by these facts. They mark the entire *mantra* literature as in a sense epigonal and they forbid pungent theories about profound differences between the family books, their authors and their geographical provenance".[12] It has also been contended, as Macdonell points out, that "in the frequent hymns addressed to the Viśvedevas or All-gods, all the deities, even the lesser ones, are praised in 'succession, and that the great mass of the Vedic hymns was composed for the ritual of Soma-offering, which included the worship of almost the entire pantheon, the technical priest could not but know the exact relative position of each god in that ritual".[13] This is also an over-simplified approach.

[11]See Hillebrandt, *Vedische Mythologie*, I, 99ff., III, 372 ff.; *Ritual litteratur*, Strassburg, 1897, Sec. II; *Varuṇa und Mitra*, Strassburg, 1877; J. Darmesteter, *Ormazd et Ahriman*, Paris, 1877; A. Christensen, *Kulturgeschichte des alten Orients*, 211 ff; J. Spiegel, *Die Arische Periode*, Leipzig, 1887, 225–33; Gruppe, *Die griechischen culte und Mythen*, I, 86–97; H. Oldenberg, *Aus Indien und Iran*, Berlin, 1889; Benvensite, *The Persian Religion*, Paris, 1929, 32ff.; Benvensite and L. Renou, *Vṛtra et Vṛthraghna*, Paris, 1934; E. Herzefeld, *Iran in the Ancient East*, London, 1941, 190ff.; A. Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, V; B.K. Ghosh, *Lingustic Introduction to Sanskrit*, 26–47.

[12] *Ṛgveda Repetitions*, Pref., XVIII.

[13] *Vedic Mythology*, 16.

The study of Ṛgvedic cosmology, cosmogony and cosmography was interlinked with that of its mythology and religion. Cosmology treats of the universe as an ordered system, and as such it is confined to a description of the salient features of the observed universe in terms of such categories as time, space, matter, etc. Cosmogony, ontology and teleology are related branches of cosmology dealing respectively with the questions concerning the origin, inner nature and purpose of the universe. Cosmography deals only with the descriptive aspects. Although scholars like Hillebrandt, Oldenberg, Macdonell, Bloomfield, Bergaigne, Keith and others dealt with these subjects, a few specialised works also came out such as the *Cosmology of the Ṛgveda*[14] by H.W. Wallis and *Zur Kosmogonie des Ṛgveda*[15] by Geldner which sought to trace the pattern of progress from crude unconnected notions to more refined ideas and broader views and to demonstrate the process of the steady but multifarious advance from concrete physical principles to the abstract, ritualistic, theistic, atheistic and psychological first principles. Wilibald Kirfel's *Die Kosmographie der Inder*[16] is a work on Indian cosmography in general in which greater emphasis is laid on the cosmography of the later tradition mostly represented by the epico-puranic as well as Buddhist and Jain sources. Only a few pages have been devoted to the Vedic period.

Most Vedic scholars of the earlier generation held that the Vedic *yajña* was an offering made to win the divine favour and that many of the ritualistic terms of the later literature were already present in the *Ṛgveda*.[17] Whether *yajña*, translated into English as 'sacrifice' was really intended for propitiating the deities is a matter of controversy. They were probably misled by their traditional conversance with the Biblical legend of Abraham's sacrifice of his own son. When in the later Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas, and subsequently in the Mimāṃsā tradition *yajña* was regarded as the world-principle to which the gods were subordinate, the entire concept of *yajña* requires a re-examination. However, it goes to the

[14]London, 1887.

[15]Berlin, 1908.

[16]Bonn, 1920. An imperfect summarisation of this work is found in D.C. Sircar's *Cosmography and Geography in Early Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1967.

[17]Cf. Hillebrandt, *Ritual litteratur*, 11 ff.; Bergaigne, *Recherches sur l'historie de la Liturgie Vedique*, Paris, 1888–89; W. Caland and V. Henry, *L'Agniṣṭoma*, Paris, 1906 besides the works on Vedic religion mentioned earlier.

credit of Vedic scholars to detect the subtle influence of the principles of magic in the earlier forms of the Vedic *yajñas*.[18] The name of W. Caland should specially be mentioned in this connection who in his *Altindisches Zauberritual* and other works made important suggestion on the magical nature of certain Vedic rituals. Oldenberg insisted on totemic beliefs inherent in some Vedic concepts, but it was contested by Keith. There are fragments of narratives in the *Ṛgveda* in the form of dialogues (*saṃvādas*), called by Oldenberg the Ākhyāna-hymns in which Sylvain Lévi[19] and L.V. Schroeder[20] had detected a rudimentary form of dramatic performance which was a part of the rituals. The philosophical hymns of the *Ṛgveda* were first compiled by L. Schermann in 1887 and these were elaborately discussed by P. Deussen in the first volume of his celebrated work.[21] The works of Wallis and Geldner, mentioned above, besides the works of those who had dealt with various aspects of Ṛgvedic mythology and religion, also throw much light on the development of philosophical ideas. But the difficulty with all these authors was that they were unable to get rid of their Christian preoccupations. They tried to find out in the *Ṛgveda* a development of monotheism from a rudimentary polytheistic and an intermediary pantheistic stage without bothering whether such a preconceived stratification of the development of ideas, in which the premises were even hypothetical, could be attributed to a text of hoary antiquity.

II

The Śaunaka recension of the *Atharvaveda* was first published by R. Roth and W.D. Whitney in 1856, and by S.P. Pandit with Sāyaṇa's commentary in 1895–98 (4 vols.). The manuscript of the Paippalāda recension was published in facsimile by M. Bloomfield and R. Garbe in 1901.[22] As early as in 1878 a good number of Atharvavedic hymns were translated into German by A. Ludwig in

[18]V. Henry, *La Magie dans l'Inde Antique*, Paris, 1904; Macdonell in *ERE*, VIII, 311–21; Keith, *RPVU*, II, 379–402.

[19]*Le Theatre Indien*, Paris, 1890, 301 ff.

[20]*Mysterium und Mimus im Ṛgveda*, Leipzig, 1908.

[21]*Allegemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I (1), *Philosophie des Veda*, Leipzig, 1894.

[22]*The Kashmirian Atharvaveda*, Stuttgart, 1901. Books I, II, IV–X of the Kashmirian recension were published with critical notes on the text by L.R.C. Barret and F. Edgarton in *JAOS*, 1906–23.

the third volume of his *Ṛgveda*. A selection of its hymns, rendered into German verse, was published by J. Grill in 1888.[23] Another German translation made respectively by A. Weber, Th. Aufrecht and C.A. Florenz in parts appeared in *Indische Studien* between the years 1887 and 1896. V. Henry made a French rendering of the books VII–XIII which came out from Paris in 1891–96. There are two complete English translations of the *Atharvaveda*, one by R.T.H. Griffith[24] and the other by W.D. Whitney, revised and edited by C.R. Lanman.[25] Besides, there is a selection of hymns in English translation made by M. Bloomfield.

Bloomfield's excellent monograph on the *Atharvaveda*, published in the Grundriss series,[26] offers practically everything that a student of Vedic literature might wish to know about it. According to him: "On the whole the *Atharvaveda* is the bearer of old tradition, not only in the line of the popular charms; but also to some extent, albeit slight, its hieratic materials are likely to be the product of independent tradition that has eluded the collectors of the other Vedas, the *Ṛgveda* not excepted." Lanman has distinguished three main divisions of the text and the subdivisions of each division on the basis of style and contents and held that books VII and XIX should be regarded as appendices of their preceding books. Irregularities of metre in the *Atharvaveda* had been pointed out by Whitney. Ridgeway insisted that the *Atharvaveda* was the record of the aboriginal as opposed to the Aryan religion. This view found support even among Indian scholars like S. Radhakrishnan who held that the Vedic Aryans, as they advanced into India, came across uncivilised tribes whose barbarous and superstitious religious practices were to a considerable extent refined owing to their contact with the Vedic civilization which in its turn was to a certain extent degraded owing to its non-Aryan contact. The *Atharvaveda* which was certainly the latest of the four Samhitās represented the amalgam of the two streams.

[23]*Hundert Lieder des Atharvaveda*, Stuttgart, 1888.

[24]Benaras, 1895–96.

[25]HOS, VII–VIII, Cambridge (Mass.), 1905.

[26]A project under the title Grundriss der Indoarischen Philology und Altertumskunde (Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Philology and Archaeology) was launched in 1897 by Bühler with the purpose of publishing specialised works on different branches of Indological research. Thirty scholars participated in this project. The first editor of this series of publication was G. Bühler and he was succeeded by F. Kielhorn, H. Lüders and J. Wackernagel.

Such approaches are undoubtedly over-simplified and historically untenable. The relation between magic and religion is highly complicated and to stigmatise the expressions of magical beliefs and rituals as superstitious or to connect them with certain races go against all canons of historical criticism. It is equally fallacious to view the *Ṛgveda* as free from all such so called indignities. It is a fact that the *Atharvaveda* is burdened with magical beliefs and practices as has been brought to light by eminent scholars on the *Atharvaveda* such as V. Henry, H. Oldenberg, F. Edgarton and others.[27] The following observation of M. Winternitz[28] is historically significant: "Indeed many of these magic songs, like the magic rites pertaining to them, belong to a sphere of conceptions which, spread over the whole earth, ever recur with the most surprising similarity in the most varying peoples of all countries. Among the Indians of North America, among the Negro races of Africa, among the Malayas and Mongols, among the Negro races of Africa, among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and frequently still among the peasantry of present-day Europe, we find exactly the same views, exactly the same strange leaps of thought in the magic songs and magic rites, as have come down to us in the *Artharvaveda* of the ancient Indians"

But when Keith said that "the *Atharvaveda* is a book of magic, mingled with some theosophy" and that these were intended to serve the class interest of the priests[29] a view which was also shared by Oldenberg—one is constrained to admit that, notwithstanding their profound knowledge of the Vedas, they displayed a biased attitude based on certain pre-conceived rigid ideas. Rather, Winternitz had a more balanced view when he said that "the great importance of the *Atharvaveda* lies in the very fact that it is an invaluable source of knowledge of the real popular belief as yet uninfluenced by the priestly religion".[30] Moreover he said that, certain as it was that among the hymns of the *Atharvaveda* there were many which were later than the great majority of *Ṛgveda* hymns, it was equally certain that the magic poetry of the *Atharvaveda* was in itself at least as old as, if not older than, the ritualistic poetry of the *Ṛgveda*, that numerous pieces of the *Arthavaveda* dated back into the same dim prehistoric times as the oldest songs of the *Ṛgveda*.

[27] V. Henry, *La magie dans l'Inde antique*, Paris, 1904; H. Oldenberg in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, VII, 1904, 217 ff.; F. Edgarton in *American Journal of Philology*, XXXV, 1914, 435 ff.

[28] *HIL*, I, 128.

[29] *RPVU*, II, 379ff.

[30] *HIL*, I, 129.

While insisting heavily on the magical elements of the *Atharvaveda* and reducing it almost entirely to the domain of the anthropologists, many prominent Vedic scholars failed to notice the intermediary position of the *Atharvaveda* as the receiver of the waves of thought which emanated from the *Ṛgveda* and as the transmitter of those waves to the successive phases with a touch of improvement. One should not fail to recall in this connection that about one-seventh of the *Atharvaveda* is taken from the *Ṛgveda* and more than half of its verses are in common with the *Ṛgveda*. The arrangement of the hymns in the eighteen genuine books is according to a definite plan, and shows fairly careful editorial activity. This is not without significance. As early as in 1887 Lucian Scherman separated the philosophical hymns of the Vedic texts, including the *Atharvaveda*, and arranged them systematically in a way that a steady development of the thought processes from the *Ṛgveda* to the Upaniṣads could be traced and understood.[31] But according to Deussen, the productive thoughts of the truly philosophical hymns of the *Ṛgveda* have attained their further development only in the Upaniṣads, and the philosophical hymns of the *Atharvaveda* can in no way be regarded as a transition-step from the oldest philosophy to that of the Upaniṣads. They stand not so much inside the great course of development, but outside. But it goes to his credit to discover sense and meaning in these philosophical hymns and to establish coherent ideas in them.[32] F. Edgerton, in his article 'The Philosophical Materials of the *Atharvaveda*'[33] went a step further when he characterised its philosophical hymns as wholly artificial, intended only to serve the practical purposes of the Brāhmanas. Winternitz, who regarded the *Atharvaveda* as a valuable document for the study of popular beliefs and customs, was equally critical about its philosophical context: "Just as the liar must sometimes speak truth, in order that one may believe his lies, so the pseudo-philosopher, too, must introduce

[31] *Philosophische Hymnen aus der Rig-und Atharva Veda Saṃhita, verglichen mit den philosophemen der alteren Upanishads*, Strassburg, 1887.

[32] Deussen, op. cit., 1894, 209 ff.

[33] *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield*, New Haven, 1920, 117 ff.

here and there into his fabrications a real, philosophical idea which he has 'picked up' somewhere or other, in order that one may take his nonsense for the height of wisdom".[34] But this does not explain the *raison d'etre* of interpolating within the text of the *Atharvaveda* what has been dubiously deemed as pseudo-philosophy especially when Winternitz himself has declared that this Saṃhitā which contains certain 'rare gems of the oldest Indian poetic art' was 'not compiled for special liturgical purposes'.

Among the recensions of the *Sāmaveda*, the Saṃhitā of the Rāṇayanīyas was edited and translated by J. Stevenson[35] and that of the Kauthumas by Th. Benfey[36] and by Satyavrata Samasrami.[37] The *Jaiminīya Saṃhitā* was edited by W. Caland.[38] Th. Aufrecht had shown that the divergent readings of the *Sāmaveda* were due only to arbitrary, intentional or accidental alterations—a view which was also shared by Brune, who made a comparative study of the *Sāmaveda* with the eighth *maṇḍala* of the *Ṛgveda*, and Oldenberg.[39] Hillebrandt held that while in the first part of the *Sāmaveda* (known as the Ārcika) the stanzas were arranged partly according to the metre and partly according to the gods, the chants of the second part (Uttarārcika) were arranged according to the order of the principal *yajñas*.[40] The origins of the *Sāmaveda* had been studied by W. Caland who argued that its second half (Uttarārcika) was older than the first—a view which was contested by Oldenberg. Since the verses of the *Sāmaveda* were intended for singing in the rituals with peculiar movements of hands and fingers, Oldenberg observed in 1908 that literary investigations on this text after all only touch upon the problems lying on the surface; in order to penetrate to greater depths, the philologist would have to be a student of the history of music as well. But as early as in 1876, A.C. Burnell studied on the melodical aspects[41] and he was followed by

[34] *HIL*, I, 156.

[35] London, 1842.

[36] Leipzig, 1848.

[37] *Bibliotheca Indica Series*, Calcutta, 1871.

[38] *Indische Forschungen*, 2, Breslau, 1907.

[39] Pref. of Aufrecht's *Ṛgveda*, J. Brune, *Zur Textkritik der dem Sāmaveda*, Kiel, 1909; Oldenberg, *Hymnen des RV*, I, 289 f.

[40] *Ritualliteratur*, 99 ff.

[41] *The Āṇeya Brāhmaṇa* etc., Mangalore, 1876, intro., xxviii, xli ff.

E. Felber (1912) and R. Simon (1913). But more important aspect of these melodies was touched by Hillebrandt[42] and Bloomfield[43] who insisted on their magical basis and their use in rituals meant to fulfil some desire. This had also been borne out by Winternitz who held that in the *Sāmaveda* the employment of various *sāmans* for magic purposes was taught, but he did not explicitly say that such employment of the *sāmans* for magical purposes could not have been mere inventions of the Vedic priests, but that they only tried to rationalise the beliefs that came down to them from their ancestors.

Among the Saṃhitās of a *Yajurveda*, the *Kāṭhaka*,[44] *Maitrāyaṇī*[45] and *Kapiṣṭhala-Kaṭha*[46] were edited by L.V. Schroeder while the *Taittirīya* by A. Weber.[47] These four constitute what is known as the Black *Yajurveda*. The White *Yajurveda* comprises a single volume (with two recensions, Kāṇva and Mādhyaṃdina, differing very little from each other) known as the *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā* which was edited along with the commentary of Mahīdhara by A. Weber as early as in 1852.[48] The text of the *Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā* was studied by Weber,[49] Keith[50] and Caland[51] with special emphasis on its contents and their interpretations. Keith's introduction to his translation of the *Taittirīya Saṃhitā* not only gives a critical analysis of the text but also deals with the mutual relationship of the Saṃhitās of *Yajurveda*. The contents of the *Vājasaneyī Saṃhitā*, along with its parallel text *Taittirīya Saṃhitā*, which deal with the *yajñas* like the Darśapūrṇamāsa, Piṇḍapitṛyajña, Vājapeya, Rājasūya, Aśvamedha, Puruṣamedha, etc. have been specially discussed by Hillebrandt,[52]

[42] *Festschrift für Konrad Hofmann*, Erlangen, 1889, 22 ff.

[43] *Wiener Zeitschrift*, XVII, 1903, 156 ff.

[44] Leipzig, 1900–1910.

[45] Leipzig, 1881–86. He has rendered a good number of its passages in German in *ZDMG*, XXXIII, 1879, 177 ff. and in *Indiens Litteratur und Kultur*, Leipzig, 1887.

[46] *Wiener Zeitschrift*, XII, 362 ff. The text is preserved only in a few fragments of manuscript; also ed. by Raghu Vira, Lahore, 1932.

[47] *Indische Studien*, XI–XIII, 1871–72; with Sāyaṇa's com. in *Bib. Ind.*, 1860–99; Eng. trans. by A.B. Keith, HOS, XVIII–XIX, 1914.

[48] Eng. trans. by R.T.H. Griffith, Benaras, 1899.

[49] *Indische Studien*, III, 451 ff.

[50] *JRAS*, 1910, 517 ff.

[51] *ZDMG*, LXXII, 1918, 12 ff.

[52] *Ritualliteratur*, 97–166.

Oldenberg,[53] Hardy,[54] Keith[55] and others. In such works the descriptive aspects of the rituals like the establishment of the fires, the new and full-moon rites, the four-month or seasonal rites, the first-fruit sites, the animal sacrifice, the Soma rites, the Jyotiṣṭoma, the Vājapeya, the Rājasūya, the Aśvamedha, the Ahina rites, the Sattras, the Srautāmaṇi, the Hotṛ formulae, etc. have been dealt with in minutest detail, the writers being eager to demonstrate their proficiency in the Vedic text, but instead of explaining them in a proper historical perspective or analysing why all such rites were formulated and what was indeed their functional role, they simply characterised these rituals as worthless and irrelevant, mere ravings of primitive insanity. Schroeder even had collected a few examples of notes written by insane persons from the psychiatrists to prove that these revealed a striking similarity with many of the passages of the *Yajurveda*. What was then need of wallowing in such a bog of nonsense with almost an unconceivable erudition?

In fact, the Western scholars of the earlier generation posed a self-contradiction, an ambivalence of judgement, while dealing with the ritualistic literature which became more pronounced in their study and interpretation of the Brāhmaṇa texts.[56] Schroeder held that as literature the Brāhmaṇas might prove to be of interest

[53] *Religion des Veda*, 437–574.

[54] *Die Vedisch-brāhmanische periode der Religion des Alten Indiens*, Munster I.W., 1893, 154 ff.

[55] Intro. to *Taitt. Saṃ.*; *RPVU*, II, 313–57.

[56] *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*, ed. with Eng. trans. by Martin Haug, Bombay, 1863; ed. with extracts from Sāyaṇa's com. by Th. Aufrecht, Bonn, 1879; ed. by K.S. Agashe, Poona, 1896; Eng. trans. by A.B. Keith, HOS, XXV, 1920; *Aṛṣeya Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by A.C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1876; *Daivata Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by J. Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1881; *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by R.L. Mitra, and H. Vidyabhushan, Calcutta, 1872; by D. Gastra, Leiden, 1919; *Kauṣitaki Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by E.B. Cowell, Calcutta, 1861; by B. Lindner, Jena, 1887; Eng. trans. by A.B. Keith, HOS, XXV, 1920, ch. X, trans. into German by R. Lobbecke, Leipzig, 1908; *Pañcaviṃśa or Tāṇḍamahā Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by A. Vedāntavāgīśa, Calcutta, 1869–74; *Sāmavidhāna Brāhmaṇa.*, ed. by A.C. Burnell, London, 1873; *Saṃhitopaniṣad Brāhmaṇa.*, ed. by A.C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1877; *Ṣaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by J. Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1881; by H.F. Elsingh, Leiden, 1908; *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*; ed. by A. Weber, Berlin and London, 1855; Eng. trans. by J. Eggeling in *SBE*, XII, XXVI, XLI, XLIII, XLIV, 1882–1900; *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by R. Mitra, Calcutta, 1855–70; *Vaṃśa Brāhmaṇa*, ed. by A.C. Burnell, Mangalore, 1873. The manuscript of the *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* is so fragmentary that it could not be properly edited, though W. Caland prepared a selection from it and published it with a German trans. in 1919.

only to students of abnormal psychology. Max Müller said, "However interesting the Brāhmaṇas may be to the students of Indian literature, they are of small interest to the general reader. The greater portion of them is simply twaddle, and what is worse, theological twaddle. No person who is not acquainted beforehand with the place which the Brāhmaṇas fill in the history of the Indian mind, could read more than ten pages without being disgusted". Sylvain Lévi, whose *La Doctrine du Sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*[57] is regarded as one of the most authoritative works on the Brāhmaṇa literature, did not also hesitate to say that it was indeed difficult to conceive of anything more brutal than the theology of the Brāhmaṇas. Richard Garbe[58] called the Brāhmanas as literary productions of a few barren centuries which preceded the rise of the philosophical thoughts in India. Oldenberg,[59] however, tries to do justice to the thoughts contained in the Brāhmaṇas which he had characterised as 'pre-scientific knowledge' and in conformity with the earlier studies of Weber he also wanted to assert that, nothwithstanding numerous modifications in detail, the theology of the Brāhmaṇas was not at the grassroot level very different from that of the *Ṛgveda*. Winternitz was perhaps right when he said that apart from the ritual precepts, the Brāhmaṇas dealt with most of the branches of human knowledge, spiritual as well as temporal, and presupposed the beginnings of grammar, phonetics and astronomy which were later on pursued more independently as Vedāṅgas.[60] According to Keith,[61] it was true that the pantheon outlined in the Brāhmaṇa literature was enlarged by a certain number of subordinate figures and that door was opened for the admission of a host of allegorical personifications, spirits, demons and goblins of every shape and genealogy which—although unknown in the *Ṛgveda*—were not necessarily all of new creation. Though the theology did not change much, he held that great changes had taken place in its spirit and organisation and that there were no obstacles *a priori* to the introduction of new rites. He also stressed, along with most Vedic scholars, that the ceremonials as well as the speculations of which the

[57] Paris, 1898.

[58] *Beitrage zur indischen Kulturgeschichte*, Berlin, 1908, 6ff.

[59] *Die Weltanschanung der Brāhmaṇa Texte*, Gottingen, 1919.

[60] *HIL*, I, 187–227.

[61] *RPVU*, II, loc.cit.

theology of the Brāhmaṇas was the subject continued to expand and grow in complexity until a new and opposite current set in.

The Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads also belong to the same class of ritualistic literature as the Brāhmaṇas. Although the Āraṇyakas are almost saturated with ritualistic details, which also holds good in the case of the Upaniṣads, most scholars were inclined to find in them a spirit of revolt against the so called mechanical sacerdotalism of the priestly class supposed to have been led by the intellectuals belonging to the Kṣatriya or the ruling class who volunteered themselves in forest life in the quest of eternal truth and thereby arrived at certain conclusions which stood in sharp difference with the world view of the earlier traditions and served as precursors of the later Upaniṣadic thoughts. Oldenberg held that the Upaniṣads formed part of the Āraṇyakas and that the name Āraṇyaka must have been derived from the fact that the discussions contained in these works were studied in the forest.[62] There was also an alternative view suggested by Deussen[63] that the Āraṇyakas were specially intended for study by persons who after serving their apprenticeship as Brāhmana students and having performed as householders their duties, retired to the forests. Oltramare held that these texts were meant for initiation into mystic doctrines.[64] According to Keith,[65] the distinction between the Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas is not an absolute one, though the Āraṇyakas sometimes tend to contain a new orientation in doctrinal and ritualistic matters. Likewise the distinction between the Upaniṣads and the Āraṇyakas is not also absolute, tradition actually incorporating the Upaniṣads in some cases in the Āraṇyakas. The most that can be said is that the term Upaniṣad, when applied to a text, normally denotes that it contains speculation mainly on the nature of the universe and of the Ātman or the Brahman. In this sense the term Āraṇyaka is never used, and thus we can perhaps see why the two different words Āraṇyaka and Upaniṣad came into being. The former is a name denoting the generic character of the texts, as those which from their secret nature must be dealt with in the special manner of being studied in the forest while the latter deals with secret knowledge of a more philosophical character.

[62] *Prolegomena*, 291 ff.

[63] *Sechzig Upanishad's*, 7 ff.

[64] *L'histoire des idees theosophiques*, I, 63.

[65] Keith's edition and translation of the *Sāṅkhāyana* and *Aitareya Āraṇyakas* were published respectively in 1908 and 1919. Friedlander's ed. of the *Sāṅkhāyana* (I–II) came out in 1900, Cowell's (III–VI) in 1861 and Keith's (VII–XV) in 1909. The *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa* was published with text, translation and notes by H. Oertel in *JAOS*, XVI, 1896.

[66] T.A. Rixner was the first man to make more generally available the contents of du Perron's Latin translation in German as early as in 1808. J.D. Lanjuinais published an abridged French version of du Perron's work in 1832. Subsequently Baron d'Ekstein published in 1833 and 1835 a few articles respectively in *Journal Asiatique* and *Journal de l'Institut Historique* on the Upaniṣads, his chief sources being the works of du Perron and Colebrooke. In a series of articles published between 1849 and 1860 in *Indische Studien* (I–II, IX), Albrecht Weber analysed the contents of du Perron's work adding his own interpretations, occasional translations and comments. In 1869 an exposition of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads as found in du Perron's Latin translation, particularly in relation to Western philosophy was published by M.K. von Krempelhuber. A German translation of du Perron's *Oupnakhat* was published by Franz Mischel in 1882.

[67] L. Poley, who edited and translated into French a few Upaniṣads, made in 1847 a German rendering of Colebrooke's essay in which he added extra matter from other Upaniṣads to emphasise Colebrooke's viewpoint.

III

The first European to translate any Upaniṣad into English from the Sanskrit original was Sir William Jones whose rendering of the *Īśā Upaniṣad* was published as early as in 1799. But this translation did not receive scholarly attention for reasons unknown. Europeans were acquainted with the Upaniṣads through Anquetil du Perron who in 1801–2 published a Latin translation of the Moghul prince Dara Shukoh's Persian version of the Upaniṣads under the title *Oupnakhat* in two volumes.[66] It was with reference to this indirect Latin translation of the Upaniṣads through a medieval Persian translation that the German philosopher Schopenhauer expressed an appreciation which has been oft-quoted in India. "It has been the most rewarding and the most elevating reading which (with the exception of the original text) there can possibly be in the world. It has been the solace of my life, and will be of my death." In 1805, H.T. Colebrooke gave extracts from the *Aitareya*, *Chāndogya* and *Muṇḍaka* Upaniṣads in his celebrated essay 'On the Vedas' published in the *Asiatic Researches*.[67] Between 1816 and 1819 Raja Rammohan Roy published the English translation of the *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, *Īśā* and *Muṇḍaka* Upaniṣads (their Bengali versions appeared at the same time) which were republished in his *Collected Works* (1832). Selections from various Upaniṣads and their philosophical suggestivity were provided in C.J.H. Windischmann's *Die Philosophie*

im Fortgange der Weltgeschichte (1827–23). In 1831, G. Pauthier in his work on Chinese Taoism presented long extracts from the *Kena* and *Īśā* Upaniṣads to suggest significant parallels between the Chinese and Indian systems of thought. In 1833 Eugene Burnouf in his *Commentaire sur le yaźna* published extracts from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* in Devanāgarī characters with Latin and French translations. F.H.H. Windischmann in his Latin work on Śaṅkara, published in 1833, provided numerous quotations from various Upaniṣads. L. Poley's French translations of the *Kaṭha*, *Muṇḍaka* and *Kena* were published between 1835 and 1837 while his editions of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Kaṭha*, *Īśā*, *Kena* and *Muṇḍaka* came out in 1844. E. Roer edited nine principal Upaniṣads in 1849–50 and published their translations in 1853–56. Among other earlier works dealing with the Upaniṣads Weber's *History of Indian Literature* (German Original, 1852), C. Speir's *Life in Ancient India* (1856) and Max Müller's *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (1859) were important. J. Muir's *Original Sanskrit Texts* in five volumes (1858–70) contains numerous, mostly brief, translations from the Upaniṣads arranged under a variety of topics.

Among subsequent publications on the Upaniṣads, E.B. Cowell published in 1861 the *Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣad*[68] edited with an English translation, while his edition and translation of the *Maitrī Upaniṣad* with the commentary of Rāmatīrtha came out in 1870. R.L. Mitra's English translation of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*[69] with extracts from the commentary of Śaṅkarāchārya was published from Calcutta in 1862. *Indian Wisdom* (1875) by M. Monier-Williams contained original translations of representative selections from the Upaniṣads. Paul Regnaud's *Materiaux pour servir a l'historie de la philosophie*, published in 1876, was the standard work on Indian philosophy until the appearance in 1907 of Oltramare's *L'Historie*. It contained numerous extracts from the Upaniṣads assembled under various topics and aimed primarily to be a systematic exposition of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, arranged under various outstanding categories.[70] F. Max Müller's English

[68]The French translation of the *Kauṣītaki* along with the commentary of Śaṅkarānanda was published in 1887.

[69]The German translation of the *Chāndogya* was published by Otto Böhtlingk in 1889 and the French by Emile Senart in 1930.

[70]Paul Regnaud's *Etudes Vediques et post-Vediques* (1898) contains the text of the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* in Roman transliteration with translation and commentary. The verse portions are lined in quatrain metrical form.

translation of twelve principal Upaniṣads in two volumes published respectively in 1879 and 1884 in the first and fifteenth volumes of the *Sacred Books of the East* series was the best and most extensive translation at the time of its publication, but it was padded with considerable extraneous matter which was added by the translator for the sake of greater intelligibility, yet which contrary to modern rules of scholarly procedure was left undifferentiated of actual text, and this evoked angry reviews from Whitney, Lanman and Tolman.

A.E. Gough's *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads and Ancient Indian Metaphysics* (1882) was mainly intended for lay readers which contained translations of four small Upaniṣads and extracts from others. According to him the Upaniṣads exhibit the pantheistic view of things in a naively poetical expression. Quoting Hegel he says that "if we wish to get so called pantheism in its poetic, most exalted, or—if one will—most crass form, one has to look for it in the oriental poets; and the most extensive expositions are found in the Indian poets". Gough indeed popularised the Upaniṣads, but many of his conclusions were over-simplified. For example, when he maintains that the Upaniṣads teach the pure Vedāntism of Śaṅkara and burdens his work with similes of illusion his position seems to be erroneous. Paul Deussen's *Das System des Vedānta* (1883) was a major work of the eighties of the nineteenth century which contained copious references to and translated extracts from, the principal Upaniṣads.[71] But it was his *Die Philosophie der Upaniṣad's* (1889) which formed the second part of the first volume of his celebrated *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie* that is still regarded as the most authentic exposition of the doctrine of the Upaniṣads, nothwithstanding its profound Kantian bias.[72] The unity of *brahman* (the cosmic principle) and *ātman* (the psychical principle) is very tersely explained by Deussen: "The *brahman*, the power which presents itself to us materialised in all existing things, which creates, sustains and preserves and receives back into itself again all worlds, this eternal infinite divine power is identical with the *ātman*, with that which, after stripping off everything external, we discover in ourselves as our real most essential being, our individual self, the soul". L. Scherman's *Philosophische Hymnen der Ṛig- und Atharvaveda Saṃhitā Verglichen mit den Philosophemen der älteren Upaniṣad's* (1887) contains a number of extracts from the earlier

[71]Eng. trans. by Charles Johnston, *The System of Vedānta*, Chicago, 1912.

[72]Eng. trans. by A.S. Geden, *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, Edinburgh, 1906.

Vedas and the Upaniṣads with footnotes collecting comparative translations of the same. L.V. Schroeder's *Indiens Litteratur und kultur in historischer Entwicklund* (1887) gives a sketch of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads with illustrative extracts. Otto Böhtlingk's edition and German translation of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* was published in 1889 and his editions of the *Kaṭha, Aitareya* and *Praśna* Upaniṣads together with German translation and critical notes appeared in 1891. W.D. Whitney's English translation of the *Katha Upaniṣad* was published in 1890.[73]

Among the principal Upaniṣadic publications of the nineties of the nineteenth century G.A. Jacob's *Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and the Bhagavadgītā* (1891) was a great and painstaking work of 1083 pages which was an exceedingly useful implement for detailed and exhaustive study of the texts. A.F. Harold's French translation of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* appeared in 1894. A complete, easy popular and useful translation of the principal Upaniṣads in two volumes under the title *The Upaniṣads* was brought out in 1896 by G.R.S. Mead and J.C. Chatterjee.[74] Paul Deussen's *Sechzig Upaniṣad's des Veda* which came out in 1897 was the most scholarly German translation hitherto been made. It contained informing and interpretative introductions to each separate section of each Upaniṣad, as well as to each Upaniṣad as a whole, also cross-references and explanatory notes. Among the expository works R. Garbe's *Die Sāṃkhya Philosophie* (1894) contained a thorough discussion of the relation of the Upaniṣads to the Sāṃkhya system. In his subsequent *The Philosophy of Ancient India* (1898) he dealt with concept of *brahman* almost in the same line as that of Deussen. H.D. Griswold's *Brahman: A Study in the History of Indian Philosophy* (1900) was a study of comparative philosophy and religion aimed at a clear and succinct introduction to the Upaniṣads. The development of the concept of *brahman* was also studied by A.S. Geden in his *Studies in Eastern Religions* (1900) in which he asserted that it was by the Upaniṣads alone that, in the ultimate resort, Indian students whether of philosophy or of religion could establish their reasonings and justify their opinions. He also added that it was from the Upaniṣads that all attempts at religious reform

[73] *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Boston, 1890, 88–112. Cf. His 'Hindu Eschatology and the Kaṭha Upaniṣad' in *JAOS*, XIII, 1889, cii–cviii.

[74] Its French translation came out under the title *Neuf Upaniṣads* by E. Marcault (1905) and Dutch by Clara Streubel in 1908.

from within had taken their rise in India, and to them all orthodox Indian reformers had turned as representing their religion in its purest form. But Macdonell was more critical when he said: "It must not of course be supposed that the Upaniṣads, either as a whole or individually, offer a complete and consistent conception of the world logically developed. They are rather a mixture of half-poetical, half-philosophical fancies, of dialogues and disputations dealings tentatively with metaphysical questions. The speculations were reduced to a system in the Vedānta philosophy".[75]

In fact, the special urge of the scholars to single out the concept of the only existent cosmic principle *brahman* and its relation with the universe from the vast and varied contents of the Upaniṣads had an interesting precondition which set forth a guideline of the Upaniṣadic studies. This will be discussed in detail when we shall deal with the Indian contribution to the Vedic and Upaniṣadic studies. However from the beginning of the twentieth century studies in the Upaniṣads had received a new dimension in the light of comparative religion and anthropology. Winternitz in his *Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur* (1907) remarked: "If we turn to the *St. Petersburg Dictionary* we find *brahman* explained as 'the devotion which appears as the craving and fulness of the soul' and strive after the gods, while according to Deussen, the *brahman* is supposed to be 'the will of man, striving upwards to that which is sacred and divine'. These explanations may correspond to Jewish-Christian ideas of divinity, but are diametrically opposed to the Indian conception of the relationship between gods and men, as we know it in the Saṃhitā and Brāhmaṇas".[76] According to him the most probable etymology was that suggested by H. Osthoff in 1899 who connected *brahman* with Old Irish *bricht* 'magic, magic formula'. Weber had previously compared *brahman* with the *logos* idea in neo-Platonism and Christianity. Deussen in his *System des Vedanta* (1883) and M.F. Hacker in his *Schopenhauer und die indische Philosophie* (1897) tried to bring *brahman* into accord with the *will* of Schopenhauer. Winternitz, however, thought that a comparison which was more justifiable was that with the *mana* of the Melanesians. This view is also hardly tenable. According to Deussen, *ātman* was "the most abstract, and therefore the best name which philoso-

[75] *History of Sanskrit Literature*, London, 1900, 226.

[76] Eng. trans. by Mrs. S. Ketkar, *History of Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1927, 247–48.

phy had found for its sole and eternal theme".[77] The view of Deussen and others that the conception of *ātman* should be traced to the true *ātman* through the preliminary steps of the Puruṣa in the eye, in the reflected image, in the shadow and in the dream-picture to which the *prāṇa* or breath of life is often added—as one finds in remarkable agreement also among the primitive races, the breath, the 'little dweller in the eye', the reflected image, the shadow and the visions, as preliminary steps to the belief in a soul—did not however find any favour in A.H. Ewing's *The Hindu Conception of the Functions of Breath* (1901, 1903) which was a complete collection and attempted interpretation of all the data found in the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads concerning various breaths.[78]

Although the Upaniṣads contain various sorts of philosophical thoughts, mostly monistic or singularistic, but also some pluralistic and dualistic ones, as well as various forms of ritualistic symbolism as inheritance of the earlier Vedic traditions, as has been amply demonstrated in P. Oltramare's *L'Historie des idees theosophiques dans l'Inde* (1907), the most important French work on the subject after Regnaud's *Materiaux* mentioned above, in which a nice sketch has been provided on the formation of various theosophic ideas in the Upaniṣads, the general trend of the approach towards the Upaniṣads was that absolute monistic view point which culminated in Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta. To quote Deussen: "On the tree of Indian Wisdom there is no fairer flower than the Upaniṣads and no finer fruit than the Vedānta philosophy. This system grew out of the teachings of the Upaniṣads, and was brought to its consummate form by the great Śaṅkara. Even to this day Śaṅkara's system represents the common belief of nearly all thoughtful Hindus, and deserves to be widely studied in the occident". Among many works following this approach L.D. Barnett's *Brahma-Knowledge: An Outline of Philosophy of the Vedānta, as set forth by the Upaniṣads and by Śaṅkara* (1907) is most important.[79] But Hermann Jacobi in his

[77]Schopenhauer named his white poodle Ātman, whereby, following the Vedantic doctrine, he desired to acknowledge the inner being as equal in man and beast, Hecker, 8.

[78]Part one in *JAOS*, XXII, 1901, 249–308; part two, published separately from Allahabad in 1903.

[79]See also Walleser, *Der ältere Vedānta* (1910); de la Vallee Poussin, *JRAS*, 1910, 128 ff.; J. Speyer, *Indische Theosophie*, Leipzig, 1914; Hopkins in *JAOS*, XXII, 380 ff.

Über die ältere Auffassung der Upaniṣad-lehren (1914) pointed out that some of Śaṅkara's later re-interpretations of Upaniṣadic passages were quite different from the original meanings.[80] He was also inclined to find some common basis existing between the Upaniṣadic doctrines and Buddhism. As early as in 1884 Max Müller said: "The Upaniṣads are to my mind the germs of Buddhism, while Buddhism is in many respects the doctrine of the Upaniṣads carried out of its last consequences and, what is important, employed as a foundation of a new social order". The validity of Max Müller's assumption was questioned, but detailed study in this supposed relation was made by H. Oldenberg in his *Die Lehre der Upaniṣaden und die Angange des Buddhismus* (1915), the first part of which dealt with the older Upaniṣads, the second with the later Upaniṣads and the beginnings of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga philosophy and the third with the beginnings of Buddhism. It was specially valuable for its tracing the historical connections of the Upaniṣads with the non-Vedāntic systems. The relation between Upaniṣads and Buddhism was also dealt with by A. Hillebrandt in his *Uber die Upanischaden* (1921).[81] R.E. Hume's English translation of the major Upaniṣads—undoubtedly a significant improvement upon the earlier translations—was published in 1921 under the title *Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*. The translation was prefixed by an introductory in which an outline of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads had been provided in eleven chapters and appended by a descriptive bibliography containing 55 pages and a list of recurrent and parallel passages in the principal Upaniṣads and the *Bhagavadgītā* prepared by George C. Haas.

While Deussen held that the Upaniṣads in no way contradicted the Vedic tradition modified through generations and maintained its continuity, a different view was suggested by some scholars, especially by Garbe and Hertel, that at a particular point of time when the Brāhmaṇas were still bent on the study of the ritual, the warrior class developed a new and striking philosophy expressed through the Upaniṣads. According to Garbe, the Kṣatriyas appeared to have revolted against the sacrificial cults of the Brāhmaṇas and introduced a monist philosophy which was subsequently appropriated by the Brāhmaṇas. He also held that the doctrine of *karma* belonged exclusively to the Kṣatriyas who

[80]In *Festchrift Ernst Windisch*, Leipzig, 1914, 153–57.

[81]*Zeitschrift fur Buddhismus*, IV, 1921, 39–51.

also insisted on the importance of morality and that the Brāhmaṇas were rather forced to adopt the Kṣatriya view by the pressure of public opinion which compelled them to adopt it into their own system. Hertel who also accepted the theory of the Kṣatriya origin of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, however, held that the doctrine of *karma* had probably little to do with the Kṣatriyas. He said that the Kṣatriyas were rationalists who depersonalised the old gods substituting in lieu the idea of nature powers, very often with greater abstractions. Keith had taken a middle stand. He admitted that the doctrine of *brahman* must have something to do with the Kṣatriya princes, but it was absurd to argue that the Brāhmaṇas were quite indifferent to it. According to him, it is impossible to deny that the *ātman-brahman* doctrine has a long previous history in the Brāhmaṇa literature and it is a logical development of the idea of unity of the *Ṛgveda*. Edgerton also emphasised on the continuity of the Vedic tradition showing the relations of the philosophical hymns of the *Atharvaveda* with those of the Upaniṣads.[82] Keith pointed out the difficulties in regard to the hypothesis set forth by Garbe who also credited the Kṣatriyas with the creation of the Sāṃkhya philosophy as a revolt against the prevailing views and also with the creation of Buddhism. One cannot properly explain why the whole Upaniṣadic tradition is Brahmanical, and yet why the texts record actions of importance as regards the doctrine by the Kṣatriya princes. Various views have been suggested but none proves to be satisfactory.[83]

Regarding the interpretation of the Upaniṣads, as indicated above, Deussen insisted that in his view Śaṅkara formulated the essential doctrine of the distinction between the empirical reality and the thing-in-itself which was later perfected by Kant and culminated in the Christian and Schopenhaurian doctrine of the primacy of the will over the intellect. The important question which arises is to what extent the doctrines of the Upaniṣads do foreshadow the views of Kant. In this context Keith who was not inclined to accept this view held that although the distinction of the subject and object was realised in the Upaniṣads, with this sense of distinction one could make little progress to the understanding of

[82] *JAOS*, XXXVI, 197–204.

[83] *RPVU*, II, 492–96, also Keith in *JRAS*, 1908, 469–73; Bloomfield, *Religion of the Veda*, 220 ff.; Oldenberg, *Die Lehre des Upaniṣaden*, 166 ff.; Oltramare, *L'historie*, I, 64 ff. etc.

the world. While in the Kantian doctrine the empiric world is regulated under definite principles of time, space and causality, the Upaniṣadic concept of identity of the self and the absolute is based merely on the subjective abstraction of the both the self and the absolute. Winternitz on the other hand favoured the approach of Deussen and held that it was not true that the Upaniṣads did not offer any explanation of the quasi-permanence of the knowing subject. He further suggested that from the mystical doctrines of the Upaniṣads one current of thought might be traced to the mysticism of Persian Sufism, to the mystic theosophical logos-doctrine of the neo-Platonics and the Alexandiran Christians down to the teachings of the Christian mystics Eckhart and Tauler. While Keith said that from the viewpoint of ethics the demerits of the Upaniṣads were more glaring than from the viewpoint of the intellect, Winternitz said that in consequence of the doctrine of *karma* the moral elements played a far greater part in the Upaniṣads than in any system and that the metaphysical doctrine of the *ātman* involved a deeper ethical idea because of its oneness with the universal soul. This approach was also supported by Hume and Mackenzie and also by Speyer who took a very favourable view of the doctrine that doing of an evil deed must be restrained by the thought that it would be punished in another life. P. Regnaud though that side by side with the high esteem for knowledge the Upaniṣads revealed a contempt for the world and a spirit of pessimism, a view which was also shared by Oldenberg, but Winternitz held that the doctrine of the Upaniṣads was at bottom not pessimistic though it was a small step from the belief in the non-reality of the world to the contempt for the world. Oldenberg, however, found stylistic parallels as existing between the Upaniṣadic and Platonic dialogues which according to him afforded a surprising insight into the life of the ancient Indian princely courts where learned persons flocked together in order to hold their disputations before the king. Regarding the character of the Upaniṣads Georg Thibaut said that they taught not one but various systems and that a system of Upaniṣadic philosophy could only be said to exist in a very restricted sense, for it was not the thoughts of one single philosopher or one uniform school of philosophers. Even in what Deussen called the fundamental doctrines, there were two distinct currents, later represented respectively by Śaṅkara and the theistic interpreters. Bloomfield suggested that some of the

Upaniṣads had strong theistic leanings, but the extent of that theism differed from one text to another. Gordon Milburn claimed that the mysticism of the Upaniṣads was superior to Christian mysticism in originality though he admitted that the former was too purely metaphysical and lacked the ethical and social content of Christian. As a missionary he thought that Christianity in India needed the Upaniṣads for its fulfilment. Oldenberg also held that the mystics like Meister Eckhardt were far more akin than Kant to the spirit of the Upaniṣads.[84]

The Śrauta, Gṛhya and Dharma Sūtras, belonging to the later Vedic age do not form part of Vedic literature, but are in close association with it. The Śrauta Sūtras deal with the great rites taught in the Brāhmaṇas and involving the services of a number of priests whereas the Gṛhya Sūtras teach the domestic rituals and other duties in the daily life of the householders. The Dharma Sūtras are perhaps a continuation of the Gṛhya Sūtras and they deal with customary laws and practices. The difference, as stated by Hopkins, is that "the weight in the Dharmas is laid on the wider relation of man to the state, so that those sections which deal with the family become condensed and subordinate".[85] With regard to the Gṛhya and Śrauta ceremonies Max Müller observed: "Though the latter (i.e. Śrauta) may seem of greater importance to the Brāhmaṇas, to us the former will be more deeply interesting, as disclosing the deep-rooted tendency in the heart of man to bring the chief events of human life in connection with a higher power, and to give to our joys and sufferings a deeper significance and a religious sanctification".[86] According to Winternitz, the customs recorded and described in the Sūtra texts have their parallels in the manners and customs of the other Indo-European peoples, a fact which goes to prove that "the relationship of the Indo-European peoples is not limited to language, but that these peoples,

[84] R. Gordon Milburn, *The Religious Mysticism of the Upaniṣads*, 26 ff.; 'Christian Vedantism' in *The Indian Interpreter*, VII, 1913, 153–60; F. Heller, *Die Mystik in den Upanisaden*, Munchen, 1925. See also W.H.G. Holmes, *The Upanisads and the Christian Gospel*, Madras, 1908; W.S. Urquhart, *The Upanisads and Life*, Calcutta, 1916; *Pantheism and the Value of Life*, London, 1919; *The Vedānta and Modern Thought*, London, 1928; H.W. Schomerus, *Indische Erlosungslehren*, Leipzig, 1919; Otto Strauss, *Indische Philosophie*, Munchen, 1925.

[85] *Cambridge History of India*, I, 229.

[86] *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, 205.

related in language, have also preserved common features from prehistoric times in their manners and customs.[87]

The significane of the Śrauta Sūtras in the context of the history of Indian religion was fully discussed by H. Hubert and M. Mauss in 1897–98 in their *Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice*.[88] Among specific rituals contained in the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras the fire rituals and the new and full moon rituals were specially studied by A. Hillebrandt;[89] the rituals of the seasons and the animal sacrifices by J. Schwab;[90] the Soma rituals with their numerous variations by W. Caland and V. Henry;[91] and the funeral customs and ancestor cults by W. Caland.[92] The entire Sūtra literature, besides the chief features of the Śrauta and Gṛhya ceremonies, had been treated in detail by A. Hillebrandt in his *Rituallitteratur* and by A.B. Keith in the second part of his *Religion and Philosophy in the Veda and Upaniṣads*.[93] Comparative studies of the customs and rituals of the Greeks, Romans, Tentons and Slavs in relation to those found in the Sūtra literature were made by E. Haas and A. Weber (*Ind. Stud.*, V), L.V. Schroeder (1888), B.W. Leist (1889), M. Winternitz (1892), O. Schrader (1901) and others. Mention should be made in this connection of the excellent paper of Winternitz under the title 'On a Comparative Study of Indo-Europeans

[87] *HIL*, I. 274. The Gṛhya Sūtras of Sāṅkhāyana, Āśvalāyana, Pāraskara, Khadira, Gobhila, Hiraṇyakeśin and Āpastamba have been translated by H. Oldenberg in *SBE*, XXIX and XXX. The Dharma Sūtras of Āpastamba, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha and Baudhāyana have been translated by G. Bühler in *SBE*, II and XIV. *Baudhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. W. Caland, *Bib. Ind.*, 1904–24; *Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. R. Garbe, *Bib. Ind.*, 1882–1903, Books I–VII, trans. into German by W. Caland, 1921; *Hiraṇyakeśī Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. with com. ASS, no. 53; *Mānava Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. F. Knauer, 1900; *Mānava Gr. S.*, ed. by the same 1897; *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. A. Weber in W.Y., IV; *Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. in *Bib. Ind.*, 1887; *Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. A. Hillebrandt, 1888; *Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra*, German trans. by R. Simon, 1923; *Vaitāna Śrauta Sūtra*, ed. and German trans.by R. Garbe, 1878 and by W. Caland, 1910. On the *Śrauta Sūtras of the Black Yajurveda* see A.B. Keith, HOS, XVIII.

[88] *Année Sociologique*, Paris, 1897–98, 29–138.

[89] *Das altindische neu-und Vollmondsopfer*, Jena, 1878.

[90] *Das altindische Tieropfer*, Erlangen, 1886.

[91] *L'Agniṣṭoma, description complete de la forme normale du sacrifice de Soma*, I, Paris, 1906.

[92] *Über Totenverehrung bei einigen der indogermanischen Volker*, Amsterdam, 1888; *Altindescher Ahnenkult*, Leiden, 1893.

[93] Grundriss, III, 2, Strassburg, 1897; *RPVU*, II, 313–432.

Customs' in the International Folklore Congress held in 1891.[94] Regarding the approach towards the Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras there was no much divergence among the scholars whose main purpose was to seek through these texts explanations of various difficult passages of the Veda. All of them insisted on the continuity of the ritualistic traditions of the earlier period in the Sūtra literature and tried to differentiate between the kernel and the accretions, the genus and the phyla, the original and fabricated forms of the rituals. Their main insistence was on textual analysis with the aim of tracing an evolutionary process behind what had been accrued therein. Unlike the other Vedic texts the Sūtra literature was not favoured with many sided academic approach.

IV

In the present survey we like to regard A.B. Keith's *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upaniṣads* (1925) as the *terminus ad quem* of all the earlier studies, because this work was the last representative of the major trends of study set forth by the nineteenth century Vedic scholars. Before dealing with the subsequent phases it is necessary to have an evaluation of the earlier Indian contribution to Vedic study which was also by no means negligible or insignificant. One should not fail to recall in this connection that the Western scholars who worked from India were immensely assisted by the Indian Pundits who did it for the labour of love and preferred to remain unnoticed and unrecognised. Apart from this particular caste of selfless activists, there were many other Indian scholars who took up Vedic studies for a variety of reasons. All of them did not follow the Western pattern of scholarship and that is why their works were not taken into account by the Western scholars. The approach of the Indian scholars was conditioned by various factors; it could not remain cent per cent academic. To them the Vedic study was not a study in itself; Vedas deemed necessary for a social, religious and moral revival; the Aryan heritage provided them with an impetus to get over the inferiority complex caused by a foreign rule. Indology in general and Vedic study in particular paved the way for the rise of a new nationalism.

With the establishment of the British rule in India, the apparent brilliance of the Western culture dazzled a section of the Indians who thought that by following the so called Hindu way of life no-

[94] *Papers and Transactions of the IFC*, London, 1892, 267–91.

thing could be achieved. There was a feeling of an all round frustration, and many persons were eager to embrace Christianity and the Western lifestyle. It was at this crucial period that Raja Rammohun Roy founded Brahma-sabhā, a new religious community which sought to prove that Christianity offered nothing new which was not present in the Indian tradition. Rammohun asserted that although the existing superstitions and idolatry, which were accrued in time and space, were objectionable and required to be fought out, yet there was no need for the Indians to embrace Christianity, for they could find a pure religion in their own sacred writings, in the old Vedas, if they only understood them. "With the object of revealing this new teaching, new thought already contained in the ancient scriptures, and causing it to be propagated by means of the religious community founded by him, the Brahmo Samāj or the 'Church of God', and also with the purpose of proving to the Christian theologians and missionaries whom he esteemed highly, that the best of that which they taught was already contained in the Upaniṣads,—he translated in the years 1816–19, a considerable number of the Upaniṣads into English and published a few of these in the original."[95]

When Devendranath Tagore was the leader of the Brahmo Samāj, in course of a controversy with the Christians (1845) the Vedas were publicly proclaimed as its basis. But the doctrine of the infallibility of the Vedas, was not liked by the rationalists like Akṣaya Kumar Datta, and it was subsequently given up on the basis of a report presented by a team sent to Vārāṇasī for the study of the Vedas. Since then the monotheistic passages of the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, compiled by Devendranath himself, became the basis of the Brahmo movement. J.B. Pratt wrote: "The directness with which the Upaniṣads speak to the Indian heart is finely illustrated in the *Autobiography* of Devendranath Tagore. He had long been seeking inner peace in vain, when one day a page of the *Īśā Upaniṣad* blew past him. He had never read any of the Upaniṣads before, and the effect of this one page was the transformation of his whole life and the new directing of all his energies. The message from the ancient book came to him as a divine answer specially sent for his salvation".[96] Devendranath's illustrious son, the celebrated poet Rabin-

[95] Winternitz, *HIL*, I, 20. The name Brahmo Samāj was given later to the community.

[96] J.B. Pratt, *India and Its Faiths*, Boston, 1915, 77–78.

dranath Tagore made the following observation in the preface of the English version of his *Sādhanā*: "Perhaps it is well for me to explain that the subject matter of the papers published in this book has not been philosophically treated, nor has it been approached from the scholar's point of view. The writer has been brought up in a family where texts from the Upaniṣads are used in daily worship. To me the verses of the Upaniṣads and the teachings of Buddha have ever been things of the spirit, and therefore endowed with boundless vital growth; and I have used them, both in my own life and in my preaching, as being instinct with individual meaning".[97]

The reformistic Arya Samāj created by Svāmī Dayānanda Sarasvatī in 1875 squarely based itself on the Vedas. Dayānanda translated the Vedas and wrote three books—*Satyārtha Prakāśa* in Hindi; *Veda-Bhāṣya-Bhūmikā*, an introduction to his Vedic commentary, partly in Sanskrit and partly in Hindi; and *Veda-Bhāṣya*, a Vedic commentary in Sanskrit on the *Yajurveda* and major part of the *Ṛgveda*. At first he included within the Vedas both Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads, but when it was pointed out that the Upaniṣads themselves repudiated the authority of the Vedas as the highest and only revelation, Dayānanda modified his views and banked solely on the *Ṛgveda*. While Raja Rammohun Roy accepted the authority of the Vedas as interpreted by the exegetics and apologetics of ancient Hinduism, Dayānanda altogether rejected the commentaries. Dayānanda's viewpoint has been explained by Bepin Chandra Pal as follows: "The nature of scriptural authority in Hindu culture differed from the scriptural authority recognised by the other great world religions in this, namely, that while Christianity or Islam claimed more or less exclusive divine authority for their own books, the Vedas never put up with any such claim. Modern Hinduism suffered in some sense from a great disability, as compared to Christianity and Islam, owing to the universal character of their scriptures, particularly of the Vedas. Dayānanda Sarasvatī recognised this disadvantage and was evidently moved by the militant spirit of evangelical Christianity and Islamic missionary propaganda to create and foster a similar militancy in Hinduism itself. He was, therefore, moved to advance for the Vedas exactly the same kind of supernatural authority and exclusive revelation, which was claimed by the Christians for their *Bible*, and by the Muslims for their *Quran*. In this Dayānanda Sarasvatī practically

[97] *Sādhanā: The Realisation of Life*, New York, 1914, Preface, vii–viii.

made a new departure from the line of ancient Hindu Fathers, from Jaimini and Vyāsa to Raja Rammohun; and at the same time practically denied the very fundamentals of modern world-thought. But even by thus deviating from the ancient line of Hindu evolution he rendered an immense service to the new nationalist movement of India".[98]

So the Indian approach was somewhat different from the very beginnings. Apart from purely academic pursuits it was associated with Hindu revivalism from which viewpoint the texts were studied and interpreted. Most prominent among such revivalists was Bankim Chandra Chatterjee who was often regarded as the father of Indian nationalism. Bankim Chandra was perhaps the first Indian scholar who was thoroughly acquainted with the Indological researches made by the Europeans. He mastered their methodology which he himself followed in the case of his own researches. But he had his own view of Indian history and civilisation. He presented a wonderful guideline how a history of India should be written from a purely Indian point of view, which remains valid till today. According to him India's misfortune was that her history was written by those who were never friends of India. It was he who pointed out categorically that the Western scholars had taken up the study of Indology from an imperialistic view point. Their plan was to popularise certain ideas which would suit their imperialistic designs. Behind the encouragement of Indological studies there was a political motivation which held good not only in the case of the British scholars but in the case of scholars belonging to other European nations as well, who acted as agents of imperialism knowingly or unknowingly. According to him, the European interest in the Vedic study was motivated by the desire to rob the Indians of the glory of producing such a vast treasure of knowledge and to misappropriate that glory for themselves having characterised the Vedas as belonging to the Indo-European or Aryan origin. He believed that behind the propagation of the myth of Aryanism the subtle intention was to prove that it was the Aryan outsiders who civilised India, and for the further development of her civilisation foreign occupation was necessary. His conviction was that India was the original home of the Aryans, and there was nothing to prove that they came from outside. Rather, in remote antiquity the Indian Aryans went abroad with a civilising mission,

[98] B.C. Pal, *Memoirs of My Life and Times*, II, Calcutta, 1932, xxxvi–xl.

as they did in subsequent periods of history in Central, Western and Southeastern Asia as also in Tibet and China, which was attested by historical evidence. The European superiority complex was so unbearable to him that very often he would criticise Max Müller even on minor issues, though from the writings of his contemporaries who knew him it is known that personally he had a deep sense of reverence for Max Müller. Regarding Weber he wrote: "Mr. Weber was undoubtedly a very great scholar, but that day must have been a black day for India on which he started learning Sanskrit"

But Bankim Chandra was not opposed to the European methodology and spoke in high terms about their sincerity and ability. His wrath was against their superiority complex and distrust for Indian evidences. For example, Weber wrote that since there was no mention of the *Mahābhārata* in the account of Megasthenes, one should come to the conclusion that it was non-existent in his time. An angry Bankim Chandra retorted: "Many Indians went to Germany, but they did not see Mr. Weber, does it imply that Mr. Weber was non-existent?" Side by side he was critical about the traditional Indian scholars for their apathy towards European scholarship. He urged the educated Indian to follow the European methodology but not to accept their views without discrimination. He wrote a good number of articles on the Vedas in Bengali and created a number of writers who contributed papers on ancient Indian religion and civilisation in *Vaṅgadarśana*, a Bengali journal published by him. Bankim Chandra's own assessment of the Vedic religion was, however, conditioned by the contemporary spirit of monotheism. His view was that despite apparent heterodoxy and polytheistic camouflage the Hindu religion basically insisted on the oneness of God, the concept of which was already foreshadowed in *Ṛgveda*, X.129. The threefold classificaiton of the Vedic deities, as was made by Yāska in his *Nirukta*, appeared to him as a basic of trinity which constitued the One. According to him, what the *Ṛgveda* really taught was that the group of deities, representing the earth, the atmosphere and the sky, were in reality various manifestations of one representative deity, and these three again were constituents of a single divine principle which was later identified with the Supreme Being of various monotheistic sects. Bankim Chandra had, however, no regard for the ritualistic texts which, in his opinion, were created by the Brāhmanas for their own selfish ends.

The contemporaries, friends and disciples of Bankim Chandra were more interested in historical researches on modern lines than in a Hindu revivalism on purer basis, though they were not opposed to socio-cultural reformation. Their commitment was more less to the European rationalism. One of them was Akṣaya Kumar Datta. Although he belonged to the Brahmo Samāj and was deeply concerned with social reformation, by conviction he was a rationalist and atheist. The Vedas failed to attract him and he was more interested in popular and folk religion. Sir R.G. Bhandarkar belonged to the reformistic Prārthanā Samāj which accepted a monotheistic form of Hinduism and liberal social views. But his religious studies, of which mention will be made later, was not mixed up with his own socio-cultural ideas. Romesh Chunder Dutt who was another illustrious contemporary of Bankim Chandra was, however, a serious Vedic scholar. In 1886 he translated the entire *Ṛgveda* into Bengali on the basis of Sāyaṇa's commentary. This Bengali translation of the *Ṛgveda* became very popular and it earned the admiration even of Max Müller who in a letter to Dutt said that he had utilised this work with profit in his own translation of the portions of *Ṛgveda*. In his *History of Civilisation of Ancient India* (3 vols., 1889–90) and *Ancient India* (1893) he had given copious extracts from the Vedas and the Upaniṣads to illsutrate how the Vedic ideas had characterised the thought-fabric of India through the ages. Romesh Chunder Dutt was quite confident about the merit of his works. In a letter to his elder brother from London in 1903 he said: "My fame as an English writer may live or perish early; but so long as it lasts, it will be connected with three works—my Civilisation, my Epics and my Economic History". This held good also in the case of his Bengali *magnum opus*, the translation of the *Ṛgveda*.

Foremost among the nineteenth century Indian scholars who were interested in the Vedic studies was Rajendralal Mitra whose sense of historical enquiry and critical acumen earned for him a universal recognition. He was a historian first and then a nationalist. In one of his lectures he said: "If patriotism means an insensate love of everything that is ours, good or bad, away with such patriotism. If it is to teach us to rest satisfied with our *Lares* and *Penates*, our language, and our civilisation, as they now stand, the less we have of it, the better".[99] Said Max Müller: "He is a *paṇḍit* by profession, but

[99] *Speeches by Rajendralal Mitra*, ed. J. Mitra, Calcutta, 1892, 29.

he is, at the same time, a scholar and critic in our sense of the word. ... In his various contributions ... he has proved himself completely above the prejudices of his class, freed from the erroneous views of the history and literature of India in which every Brahman is brought up, and thoroughly imbued with those principles of criticism which men like Colebrooke, Lassen and Burnouf have followed in their researchers into the literary treasures of the country. His English is remarkably clear and simple, and his arguments would do credit to any Sanskrit scholar in England". His lifelong association with the Asiatic Society of Bengal under various capacities and acquaintance with the modern scientific methods of editing ancient texts brought him directly in connection with the textual project of *Bibliotheca Indica* series launched by the Asiatic Society. Rajendralal Mitra's Vedic studies comprised the English translation of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* with the commentary of Śaṅkara (1854) and the learned critical editions of the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* with the commentary of Sāyaṇa (1859, 1862, 1890), the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (1872), the *Taittirīya Pratiśākhya* of *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* with the commentary *Tribhāṣyaratna* (1872), the *Gopatha Brāhmaṇa* of the *Atharvaveda* (1872), the *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* (1876) and the *Bṛhaddevatā* of Śaunaka (1892). His historical work *The Indo-Aryans* (in two volumes, 1881), though suggestive of Vedic association, had, however, nothing to do with the Vedas. It was a collection of essays on different aspects of ancient India.

Following the footsteps of Rajendralal Mitra many Indian scholars came forward to edit and translate various Vedic texts. A. Vedāntavāgīśa who was a close associate of Mitra edited the *Sāmaveda* in 1873. His other works comprised the edition of Yāska's *Nirukta* with commentary, index and a Sanskrit exposition (1882–91)[100] and the *Sāmapratiśākhya* and a few other texts of the Śikṣā-category of the Vedāṅgas. Jīvananda Vidyāsāgara, another associate of Mitra, edited the *Chāndogya* (1873) and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (1875) Upaniṣads, both with the commentary of Śaṅkara and the gloss of Ānandagiri and the *Daivata* and *Ṣaḍviṃśa* Brāhmaṇas (both published in 1881).[101] Yamunā Śaṅkara brought out the *Muṇḍaka* and

[100]The *Nirukta* of the Yāska was first edited by R. Roth, Gottingen, 1852.

[101]J. Vidyāsāgara was sometimes confused by European scholars with the celebrated Iśvara Chandra Vidyāsāgara. But he was a different person, son of Taranath Tarkavācaspati who was the author of the well known lexical work *Vachaspatyam*. Iśvara Chandra Vidyāsāgara was not interested in Indology. He had edited only a single work, Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*.

Praśna Upaniṣads with commentaries in Hindi founded on the versions of Śaṅkara and Ānandagiri (1884). Tārācharan Tarkaratna edited the *Īśā Upaniṣad* with a commentary called *Vimalā*.

Among other Vedic texts edited by Indian scholars mention should be made of the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* by K.S. Agashe (1896) who had also edited the *Kena Upaniṣad* with the commentary of Śaṅkara, supercommentary of Ānandagiri, together with the *dīpikās* of Śaṅkarānanda and Nārāyaṇa (1888, 1896), the *Chāndogya* (1890) and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (1891) Upaniṣads, both with the commentary of Śaṅkara and the gloss of Ānandagiri.[102] The *Vājasaneyiprātiśākhya* was edited by P.Y. Pathak (1885–88), the *Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra* with Harihara's commentary by Ladharam Sarman (1890) and the *Atharvaveda* with Sāyaṇa's commentary by S.P. Pandit (1895–96) Bhimsen Sarma edited the *Taittirīya, Aitareya, Kena, Kaṭha, Īśā, Muṇḍaka, Praśna, Māṇḍūkya* and *Śvetāśvatara* Upaniṣads (1892–97). V.K. Rajvade edited the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* with the commentaries of Śaṅkara, Ānandagiri and Gopālayatīndra (1897) and Svāmī Tulasīrāma, the *Śvetāśvatara* with Sanskrit and Hindi commentaries (1897). V.S. Islampurkar edited the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* with the commentary of Śaṅkara and supercommentary of Śaṅkarānanda and Vidyāratna (1889) and a second edition of the same (1897) with an added commentary of Ānandagiri, while Ramkrishna Sastri brought out the same text in the Grantha character, together with selections from the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* and *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (1900). Another version of the same Upaniṣad in the Grantha character and in Dravidian recension was brought out by M. Vaidyanātha (1903) and in Telugu character with the commentary of Sāyaṇa by G. Sutariya (1904), Zalim Singh brought out the *Taittirīya, Aitareya, Muṇḍaka* and *Praśna* Upaniṣads with Hindi glossaries (1900). M.N. Dutta made an English translation of the *Ṛgveda* which was published in 1906. Mention should also be made of the editions of the *Gobhila Gṛhyasūtra* (1906) and the *Gṛhyasaṃgrahapariśiṣṭa* (1910) by Chandrakānta Tarkālaṅkāra, the *Khādira Gṛhyasūtra* by A. Mahādeva Śāstrī and L. Śrīnivāsācārya (1913), the *Baudhāyana Gṛhyasūtra* by R. Shamasastry (1920), the *Nirukta* with translation by L. Sarup (1920) and with Durgācārya's commentary by V.K. Rajvade (1921–28), the *Atharvaveda Prathiśākhya* by V.B.V. Sasuri (1923), the *Pāraskara Gṛhyasūtra* by G.S.

[102]Agashe also edited the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* for a second time in 1895 with the commentary entitled *Mitākṣarā* of Nityānanda.

Nene (1926), the *Kātyāyana Śrautasūtra* by V.D. Sharma (1933–37) etc.

Indian scholars were more interested in the Upaniṣads. The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* was edited with a Hindi translation and a Hindi commentary founded on the works of Śaṅkara and Ānandagiri and notes by Pītāmbar Śarma (1892) and with text and English translation, together with translations of parts of Mādhava's commentary by Srisa Chandra Vasu (1913–16). The *Chāndogya* was edited with the commentary of Śaṅkara and a Bengali translation by Mahes Chandra Pal (1885–87), with Śaṅkara's commentary and an English translation by Ganganath Jha (1899), in Telugu and Tamil characters with Tamil commentaries by B.S. Brahmaswamy (1899) with a Telugu translation and commentary based on Raja Rammohun Roy's interpretation by M.B. Pantulu (1899), with Hindi translation and a Sanskrit commentary setting forth the doctrines of the Ārya Samāj by S.S. Sarma (1905) and with translation of the commentary of Madhva by Srisa Chandra Vasu (1909–10). The *Taittirīya* was edited with Telugu translation and commentary by M.B. Pantulu (1889), with Bengali translation and notes by Sundarananda Acharya (1896), with Kannada translation and notes in Kannada character by R.S. Venkatakrishnaiya (1901) with English translation of the commentaries of Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Sāyaṇa by A. Mahadeva Sastri (1903) and with text and English translation with notes commentaries by S.C. Vidyārṇava and M.L. Sandal (1925). The *Aitareya* was edited with a Marathi introduction and a translation and notes in English by R.R. Bhagavata (1898) with English translation of Saṅkara's commentary by H.M. Bhadkamkar (1899) and with English translation by S.C. Vidyārṇava and M.L. Sandal (1925). The *Kauṣītaki* was edited with English translation, notes and commentary by S.C. Vidyārṇava and M.L. Sandal (1925). The *Kena* was edited with English translation and exposition by Chhajju Singh (1891) and Durga Prasad (1898) with a Hindi translation and exposition by B.D. Sarma (1901) and with Sanskrit text, *anvaya, vṛtti*, word-meaning, English translation, notes and index by Srisa Chandra Vasu and A.C. Thisiwal (1902). The *Kaṭha* was edited with Hindi translation and exposition by B.D. Sharma (1903), with Sanskrit text, *anvaya, vṛtti*, word-meaning, English translation, notes and index by Srisa Chandra Vasu (1905) and with introduction, text, English translation and notes by R.L. Pelly (1924). The *Īśā* was edited with Sanskrit text with English translation and exposition by Guru Datta (1888), with a Hindi translation in verse by Satyānanda Muhammad (1890), with English translation by Chhajju Singh (1891), with text, easy Sanskrit notes, English and Bengali transaltions by Jadunath Majumdar (1893), with commentaries of Śaṅkara. Anandagiri, Baladeva and Vidyābhūṣaṇa and translation and author's commentary both in English and in Bengali by S.L. Gosvami (1895), with an Urdu translation and commentary based on the teachings of the Ārya Samāj (1899), with Hindi translation by B.D. Sharma (1901), with Sanskrit text, *anvaya, vṛtti* word-meaning, English translation, notes and index by Srisa Chandra Vasu and A.C. Thisiwal (1902), with Gujarati explanation by B. Ganda (1906) and with a Tantric commentary of Kaulācārya Sadānanda and a foreword of Arthur Avalon by J.L. Majumdar (1918). The *Muṇḍaka* (1893) and the *Praśna* (1899) were edited with English translation by Durga Prasad. The latter was also edited by Sitaram Sastri with Śaṅkara's commentary in 1898. The *Māṇḍūkya* was edited with English translation by Guru Datta (1893) and Har Narayan (1895), the *Śvetāśvatara* by R.R. Bhagavata (1900) and S.V. Shasuri (1916) and the *Maitrī* by S.C. Vidyārṇava and M.L. Sandal (1926).[103]

So far as the matter of edition and translations was concerned, the contribution of the Indian scholars was no less insignificant, but in the case of writing independent treatises on different aspects of the Vedas and other ancient texts, in analysing and interpreting their contents the Indian scholars lagged far behind their European counterparts. There were also some material difficulties which were no less responsible for this lack of enthusiasm among Indian scholars to produce learned research works.[104] However,

[103]Among the text editions of the collected Upaniṣads made by Indian scholars the following may be noted: J. Vidyāsāgara, *Six Upaniṣads* (1873) and *Three Upaniṣads* (1884); Subrahmanya Sastri, *Hundred and Eight Upaniṣads* (1883); V.R. Ramachandra, *Upaniṣatsaṃgraha* with Sanskrit glosses and Marathi paraphrases (1885); K.V. Hariratmaja, *Eleven Upaniṣads* (1885); Sri Pitambara, *Eight Upaniṣads* (1890); K.V. Sastri and R.C. Munjurpattu, *Hundred and Eight Upanisads in Grantha Characters* (1896); A.S. Tatacharya, *Ten Upanisads in Grantha and Telugu Characters* (1897–98); V.L. Shasri Phansikar, *Twenty Eight Upaniṣads* (1906) and Swami Achintya, *Eleven Upaniṣads* (1910).

[104]The European scholars had the strength of academic organisations behind them. There are many institutions, besides the universities to sponsor and finance their projects. In India, with rare exceptions, there was no question of getting institutional support in publishing a research work. For publishing a book the author had to

the Indian Vedic scholars were more interested in chronology and history rather than the study of religion in itself. This does not mean that they did not work on religion. They did. But there were some problems in regard to their approach to religion which we propose to discuss later. Regarding the historical studies, they were interested in two basic questions which was then very much relevant to their nationalistic approach. They were proud of their Aryan heritage. But they did not like the idea that the Aryans came from Europe or Central Asia. Their conviction was that when the ancient Aryan civilization was at its zenith in India, the people of Europe and Central Asia were still in barbarous stage. Thus the Aryans must have originated from India and spread their civilisation abroad. If the assumption that the Aryans came from outside was irresistable, their civilisation which had a divine flavour must have come from an extraordinary region like the North Pole. This was the thesis of Bal Gangadhar Tilak as presented in his *Arctic Home in the Vedas* (1903). The second question was about the date of the Vedas which they wanted to attribute to a hoary antiquity. Tilak in his *Orion or Researches into the Antiquity of the Vedas* (1893) suggested that at the period of the Brāhmaṇas the Pleiades (*kṛttikās*) formed the starting point of the *nakṣatra* series and coincided with the vernal equinox. But in the Vedic texts traces of an older calendar are also found in which the vernal equinox fell in the Orion (*mṛgaśiras*). From the calculation of the value of precision it appeared to him that about 2500 BC the vernel equinox lay in the Pleiades and about 4500 BC in the Orion, and hence the Vedic texts could be dated in 6000 BC. Surprisingly enough, Hermann Jacobi arrived at the same conclusion on the basis of a different type of calculation, though he contended himself with placing the beginnings of the Vedic civilisation at about 4500 BC. In another work *Vedic Chronology and Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* (1925). Tilak

pay from his own pocket. Even celebrated authors like Bankim Chandra Chatterjee or Rabindranath Tagore, who had a vast readership, had to publish their books at their own cost. But, surprisingly enough, under such an adverse condition, the business of bringing out religious texts and their translations flourished. It is a sad and interesting story connected with the beginnings of Indological publications in India, which ought to be recorded. Some publishers smelt that there was a good market for Sanskrit religious texts and their translations in regional languages. They approached various traditional scholars requesting them to collect manuscripts, edit or translate them. Though they promised that they would pay the scholars for their labour, they paid them really nothing.

tried to establish his previous view point with some new form of evidence. Ghate's *Lectures on the Ṛgveda*, originally published in 1915, and subsequently re-edited by V.S. Sukthankar in 1926, was an important contribution which dealt with Vedic literature, its arrangement, nature and method of studies, religion and mythology, social life, grammar and metre. Abinas Chandra Das in his *Ṛgvedic India* (1921) and *Ṛgvedic Culture* (1925) had followed the approach of the European scholars in systematising and describing the contents of the *Ṛgveda*, but in regard to its date he claimed an horribly incredible antiquity. Regarding the Ṛgvedic religion he shared the view of most Indian scholars that its polytheism was only an outward expression, deification of various natural phenomena, but the central idea was monotheistic, one in form of many.

The *Yajñakathā* written in Bengali in the beginning of the present century by Ramendra Sundar Trivedi was a significant departure from the prejudices of modernism with which the learned Indians of the nineteenth century were acquainted by the European and reformistic mentors. The *yajñas*—the sacrificial cults as they were improperly called—were thought of by the then enlightened neo-Hindus as mischievous manipulations of the wily priests who were instrumental in polluting the pristine purity of the Vedic religion. This was also the view of Svāmī Vivekananda expressed in his various writings in which it was frankly stated that the Brāhmanas induced the kings and wealthy persons to perform the *yajñas* for extracting wealth from them and by doing so they vulgarised the Vedic religion. Viewed against this background, Ramendra Sundar Trivedi's small book was an outstanding contribution to the study of Vedic religion. Trivedi, who also translated the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* into Bengali, was a scientist by profession and an ardent nationalist in outlook. With his natural scientific inclination he tried to understand—without any theoretical preoccupation, any ancient or modern superstition and moral bias by which the socio-religious ideas of his time were conditioned—what the *yajñas* really meant to those who performed them and outlined the rationale of their efficacy explaining why they were consistent with a particular way of life.

Indian writers were more interested in the study of the history of Indian thought, the typical Indian attitude towards the life and universe in different periods of history, rather than minute documentations of the mythological, cultic and ritualistic elements by

which the inspiring basic ideas and concepts which are valid even today were shrouded. In other words, philosophy was their chief source of attraction in which field of course the Europeans scholars had already made some groundwork in their own way. Indian scholars were undoubtedly influenced by such works as Oldenberg's *Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa Texte* (1919) and his handy monograph on Indian philosophy in the 'Kultur der Gegenwart' series, Jacobi's monograph in the 'Lich des Ostens' series, Hertel's *Die Weischit der Upanishaden* (1921) besides his several publications in the series entitled 'Indo-Iranische Quellen und Forschungen', Paul Masson Oursel's *Esquisse d'une Historie de la Philosophie Indianne* (1923), Otto Strauss's *Indische Philosophie* (1925), etc. and a large number of contributions by various scholars to the learned publications of Europe, but they thought that these were one-sided. This one-sidedness was not, however, intentional but unavoidable owing to the fact that despite profound scholarship and all other academic requirements they lacked the typical Indian ethos. As Mircea Eliade observed: "When one approaches an exotic principality, one understands principally what one is predestined to understand by one's own vocation, by one's own cultural orientation and that of the historical moment to which one belongs. This truism is of general application".

So need was felt for establishing the purely Indian point of view to be based squarely on Indian tradition. But this was also impossible, the reason of which we shall discuss while dealing with terminological studies. Indian approach was not also free from one-sidedness. The basic approach was that the entire thought-structure of India was a complete unity. The contradictions found in the early Vedic texts were actually many aspects of the same reality which had received the most perfect expression in the Upaniṣadic monism. This approach developed by so many scholars[105] found its final culmination in Radhakrishnan's historical comment: "The Upaniṣads being the earliest form of specualtive idealisms in the world, all that is good and great in subsequent philosophy looks like an unconscious commentary on the

[105]R.C. Bose, *Hindu Philosophy Popularly Explained*, New York, 1884; N.R. Apte, *The Doctrine of Māyā*, Bombay, 1896; Dalpat Rai, *The Upaniṣads: An Introduction to Their Study*, Lahore, 1897; Swamy Abhedananda, *Vedānta Philosophy*, New York, 1905; P.D. Sastri, *The Doctrine of Māyā*, London, 1911; S. Tattvabhusan, *On the Theism of the Upaniṣads*, Lahore, 1921; M.L. Sandal, *Philosophical Teachings in the Upaniṣads*, Allahabad, 1926.

Upaniṣadic ideal, showing how free and expansive and how capable of accommodating within itself all forms of truth that ideal is."[106]

Though this synthetic approach showing everything as part of a single homogeneous cultural or intellectual trend dominated the Indian scholarship, there were also divergences in approach. This divergence was found in B.M. Barua's *History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy* (1921), the original purpose of which was to trace the roots of Buddhism and other subsequent systems to the Vedas. Barua tried to single out individuals and their doctrines as far as possible from the mess of the contents of the Vedic literature. Some divine character were considered by him as thoughtful individuals. Among the early Vedic thinkers he was able to identify separately the doctrine of Aghamarṣaṇa, Prajāpati, Brahmaṇaspati, Anila, Dīrghatamas, Nārāyaṇa and Mahīdāsa Aitareya. Among the philosophers of the later Vedic age in which the principal Upaniṣads were composed he made a twofold chronological division—pre-Uddālaka and post-Uddālaka. In the former period he placed Suravira Sākalya, Māṇḍukeya Kauntharvya, Raikva, Bādhva, Śāṇḍilya, Satyakāma Javāla and Pravahana Jaivali while in the latter Gārgyāyana, Pratardana, Uddālaka, Varuṇa, Balāki, Ajātaśatru, Yājñavalkya, Āsuri, Paippalāda and Naciketas. Although previously Deussen also connected certain special doctrines with certain individuals, he considered that the doctrinal divergences were specifically different but generically alike. But Barua insisted more on the differences seeking their roots to diverse phenomena and tried to locate in them sources of later intellectual growth of varied types.

The first volume of S.N. Dasgupta's *History of Indian Philosophy* came out in 1922. Its second chapter dealt with the Vedas and the third with the earlier Upaniṣads. According to him, excepting in some of the hymns of the later parts of the *Ṛgveda*, which was probably composed about 1000 BC, there was not much philosophy in them in the modern sense of the term. "It is here that we first find intensely interesting philosophical questions of more or less cosmological character expressed in terms of poetry and imagination. In the later Vedic works called the Brāhmaṇas and the Āryaṇyakas, written mostly in prose, which followed

[106]S. Radhakrishnan, *The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy*, London, 1920, 451.

the Vedic hymns, there are two tendencies, viz. one that sought to establish the magical forms of ritualistic worship, and the other which indulged in speculative thinking through crude generalisation. This latter tendency was indeed much feebler than the former, and it might appear that the ritualistic tendency had actually swallowed up what little of philosophy of the later parts of the Vedic hymns were trying to express, but there are unmistakable marks that this tendency existed and worked." In the case of the Upaniṣads Dasgupta insisted more on the diversities of their contents than on unity of their thought-structure.

So far as the question of interpretation was concerned Dasgupta depended squarely on the commentators, but his own interpretations mostly covered the historical aspects. Radhakrishnan's stand was, however, different. In his *Indian Philosophy*, the first volume of which appeared in 1923, he stated: "The task of the historian is hard, especially in philosophy. However much he may try to assume the attitude of a mere chronicler and let the history in some fashion unfold its own inner meaning and continuity, furnish its own criticism of errors and partial insights, still the judgements and sympathies of the writer can not be hidden. Besides Indian philosophy offers another difficulty. We have the commentaries which, being older come nearer the time to the work commented upon. The presumption is that they will be more enlightening about the meaning of the text. But when the commentaries differ about their interpretations, one cannot stand silently by without offering some judgement on the conflict of views. Such personal expressions of opinion, however dangerous, can hardly be avoided". Radhakrishnan had devoted three chapters on the Vedic philosophy respectively under the titles 'Hymns of the *Ṛgveda*'; 'Transition to the Upaniṣads'; and 'Philosophy of the Upaniṣads'. The chapter entitled 'Philosophy of the Upaniṣads' was also published as a separate monograph in 1924 with a Foreword of Rabindranath Tagore.

The best example of analytical approach was, however found in the *History of Indian Philosophy* (1927) by S.K. Belvalkar and R.D. Ranade. Among the proposed eight volumes of this series only the second volume was published. This broad-based work was divided into ten chapters. (i) Transition from the Later Vedic to the Brāhmaṇa period; (ii) A Survey of Brāhmaṇa Speculations; (iii) Transition from the Brāhmaṇa to the Upaniṣadic Period; (iv–viii) Critical Exposition of Upaniṣadic Texts; (ix) Evaluation of Upaniṣadic Philosophy; and (x) Post-Upaniṣadic Thought-Ferment. Chapters IV–VIII were written by R.D. Ranade while the others by S.K. Belvalkar. Ranade had already published an analytical study under the title *The Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy* (1926) which appeared as the second volume of a proposed Encyclopaedic History of Indian Philosophy project launched by the Academy of Philosophy and Religion of which Ranade himself was the director. However, the credit of the authors of the present volume lay not only in separating various streams of thought and their contents, but also in the comparative method they had adopted in explaining the intricacies of various religio-philosophical concepts. And they had accomplished the most difficult job of stratifying the texts on the basis of their contents and chronology. They divided the Upaniṣadic texts into several disparate units, and then with the help of usual stylometric and other objective tests arranged those units into chronological groups. That certain Upaniṣads were composite products was indeed realised long ago by Deussen and others; but none before Belvalkar and Ranade had attempted to rearrange fifty odd units into chronological groups, and with their help to determine the exact line of thought-evolution warranted by such a stratification. Secondly they had attempted to bring the Upaniṣadic thought quite in a line with that of the Brāhmaṇas and the Āraṇyakas and had accordingly treated as Upaniṣads some of the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka texts that happened not to have been designated as Upaniṣads. The authors also felt keenly that without a multi-disciplinal approach all philosophical superstructure was likely to tumble down like a castle of cards.

V

Louis Renou's *Bibliographie Vedique* published in 1931 contained complete list of works on Vedic subjects done up to the year 1930. Works done up to 1945 were listed in the first volume of R.N. Dandekar's *Vedic Bibliography* (1946) which like its predecessor volume was classified subjectwise under different heads such as language, grammar, literature, history, society, economy, polity, religion, philosophy and so on. Each of the categories was again subdivided into various branches accordingly to the nature of their contents. Thus the categories of Religion and Mythology was subdivided into General Studies; Hinduism; Vedic Religion and Mythol-

ogy; Major Divinities of the Vedas (in alphabetical order); Minor Divinities in the Vedas; Vedic Divinities in general; Legends, Myths and Symbols; Rituals and Rites; Cults and Festivals; and Vedism, Hinduism and other Religions while that of philosophy was into General and Indian; Vedic and Upaniṣadic; Cosmology; Metaphysics; Ethics; Psychology; Epistemology; Eschatology; Yoga; and Miscellaneous Philosophical topics. The second volume of Dandekar's *Bibliography* containing list of books and articles published till 1960 came out in 1961 while the third volume dealing with works done upto 1972 came out in 1973. In Dandekar's *Bibliography* space was also provided for studies in comparative religion and other forms of studies having direct and indirect bearing on the Vedas or Vedic culture and tradition. In fact it contained names of books and articles pertaining to every branch of Indian religion because, apart from the works on Buddhism and Jainism, most works on Indian religion contained references to the Vedas. Even some works on Buddhism or Jainism, in which something about Vedic culture or religion or philosophy was discussed, were also included. For another reason Dandekar's *Bibliography* was important. It contained titles of unpublished Doctoral dissertations laboriously collected from different University sources, and this enabled the interested persons to know what was going on in the field of Vedic researches.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, as we have indicated above, there was a change in approach and orientation in the case of the Vedic studies. One important characteristic of this change was the insistence on the study of Vedic mythology in a new perspective. One exponent of the functional school of anthropology, Marcel Mauss insisted on the 'total social facts' in reference to religious symbols and myths and their irreductibility in terms of other functions. Malinowsky, whose views have been mentioned in the first chapter, changed the emphasis and attributed the necessity of myth in the functions it fulfilled in primitive cultures, justifying and preserving the social, ethical, aesthetic and religious customs and institutions. He characterised mythology as a mirror of social relationship. The exponents of the structural school held that myths all over the world resembled one another and that they were projections of the vital experiences of a people. Lévi Strauss looked for the resemblances in a certain logical coherence, in analogy to pattern in linguistics, in the theory of cultural diffusion and in extreme cases in psychological factors. "In history when it is called upon unremittingly (and it must be called upon *first*) can not yield an answer, then let us appeal to psychology, or the structural analysis of forms; let us ask ourselves if internal connections whether of a psychological on logical nature, will allow us to understand parallel recurrences whose frequency and cohesion cannot possibly be the result of change."[107] Jung said that human mind had always thought in terms of archetypes which were buried deep in the collective unconscious, and myths were the projection of these archetypes. Mircea Eliade's [108] attraction to this concept of archetypes was also significant but his range was wider which comprised the findings of all the allied and relevant disciplines accepted in a moderate scale. He insisted on the common patterns in different mythological systems and tried to probe into the cultural roots of these patterns.[109]

So far as the Vedic mythology was concerned previously we remarked that although Macdonell, Bloomfield and Schroeder sought to revive the methods of comparative mythology Pischel and Geldner did not like to attach much importance to it. Their viewpoint was that the Vedic religion and mythology should be studied primarily from the Vedic sources. Comparative mythology and other disciplines should have only a secondary application. Subsequently this approach was upheld by Louis Renou[110] and J. Gonda[111] who were primarily Indologists, though not indifferent to other disciplines. E. Benveniste sought to endow the methods of comparative linguistics with new precision and to apply them to the religious vocabulary in or attempt to lay bare the primary notions underlying them. On the other hand Georges Dumezil in his *Ournos-Varuṇa* (1934), *Mitra-Varuṇa* (1948) and *Le troisieme souverain* (1949) tried to revive the discipline of comparative mythology also incorporating into it certain aspects of structural anthropology and other allied disciplines. He suggested a tripartite hierarchical divi-

[107] C. Lévi Strauss, *Structural Anthropology*, New York, 1964, 248.

[108] M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, London, 1958; the original French version appeared in 1949; *Images and Symbols*, London, 1961; *Myth and Reality*, London, 1964.

[109] Karl Kerenyi and E. Neumann had also a similar approach.

[110] *Vṛtra et Vṛthragna*, Paris, 1935; *La Poesie religieuse de l'Inde antique*, Paris, 1942.

[111] *De Vedische godsdienst*, The Hague, 1943; *Some Observations on the Relations between 'Gods' and 'Powers' in the Vedas*, 1957; *The Vision of the Vedic Poets*, The Hague, 1963; *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, The Hague, 1965.

sion of Indo-European social organisation (priests, warriors and food- producers) as the basis of a common ideology which gave rise to a threefold mythology. The top level that was priestly, which combined in it the magico-religious and juridical aspects, was represented by Varuṇa and Mitra like their Roman counterparts Jupiter and Dius Fidius or German counterparts like Odin and Tyr. The second or warrior level was represented by the Vedic deities like Indra or Rudra, the Roman Mars and Germanic Thor. The third level was represented by the deities of vegetation and fertility. Dumezil furhter extended his scheme to Celtic and Scandinavian mythology. S.C. Littleton's *New Comparative Mythology* (1966) offered critical assessment of the views of Dumezil.

Ananda Coomaraswamy's approach to Vedic mythology should also be taken into account in this connection.[112] One should not fail to recall his mastery over the Eddaic literature of the Teutons.[113] And apart from his knowledge of the Greek and the Roman mythology, he was well acquainted with the Celtic *Mabinogion* and the Hebrew Talmud literature. Naturally his view point was comparative which was further facilitated by the evolutionist approach of the anthropological studies which dominated the field till the mid-thirties. Researches of the evolutionists enabled him to see in the rituals actual magical mimings of anterior events or phenomena of any kind, performed to achieve certain ends. He held that mythologies in original were literary and imaginary reproduction of such magical beliefs and practices and that their symbolic transformations formed ingredients of primitive art. But he did not follow these ideas mechanically. For example, in his treatment of the flood legends[114] described in the Brāhmaṇas and the Purāṇas and also of those belonging to non-Indian traditions he admitted the probability of their common origin and thought it prudent to interpret the Indian legends in terms of the metaphysical concept of cosmic time, *manvantara*, the transition from one age to another. The dissolution of the world after completing the term of existence and the beginning of a new span of existence are always intervened by a total flood and the arc in that oceanic vastness is symbolic of a patriarchal Voyage (*pitṛyāna*). The end of every *kalpa* or span of time, equivalent

[112]Cf. His *A New Approach to the Vedas*, London, 1933; *Coomaraswamy: Selected Papers*, ed. by Roger Lipsey.

[113]Cf. his translation of the *Voluspa*, London, 1909.

[114]Selected Papers, II, 398 ff.

to a certain extent the Last Judgement of the Chrisitians or the Eddaic *ragna rok*, the dusk of the gods, and the genesis of a new *kalpa* after the intervening inundations, brought about by a patriarch of angelic origin (Manu), have been viewed as a symbolic representation of what is called the doctrine of reincarnation, which is bound up with the notion of latent causality known in Indian philosophical tradition as *adṛṣṭa* or *apūrva*, the unseen preconditions of generating effects. Coomaraswamy sought to interpret the Vedic terms and concepts in their real perspective in the light of philological findings and the view points of the traditional commentators like Yāska. "All that we can learn from literary history is that the doctrines which are taken for granted in the mantras were not, perhaps, published until after a certain amount of linguistic change had already taken place; we may find some new words, but we do not meet with new ideas. It is our fault if we cannot see that Mitravaraṇau, of whom the latter is 'the immortal brother of the mortal former' are none other than the *apara* and *para brahman* to whom the Upaniṣads refer as mortal and immortal respectively."[115] While most of the Vedic scholars postulated the gradual development of monotheism in the Vedas evolving out of polytheistic conditions represented by personified attributes of nature, Coomaraswamy contradicted this view saying that in the Vedas a single monotheistic principle had given rise to a superficial appearance of polytheism.[116]

Mythological studies from various viewpoints of individual Vedic gods were always popular among Vedic scholars, but since 1920s such studies received wider dimensions owing to the variety of reasons. In the case of the micro-studies significant contribution was made by K.C. Chattopadhyay who wrote and published a series of articles in various journals since 1927 on Vedic topics.[117] Most important among them pertaining to religion and mythology were 'Indra in the *Ṛgveda* and the *Avesta*', 'Cradle of Indra-Vṛta Myth' and the 'Vṛṣākapi hymns'. His analysis of the Vṛṣākapi hymns was so much penetrating and exhaustive that it earned the admiration of M. Winternitz who said that this work should be the model of

[115]Ibid., 166 ff.

[116]For details see N.N. Bhattacharyya, 'Coomaraswamy and Indian Religious History' in *Ananda Coomaraswamy: A Centenary Volume*, Calcutta, 1981, 101–10.

[117]His articles were collected and published in two volumes by his pupil V.N. Misra under the title *Studies in the Vedic and Indo-Iranian Religion and Literature*, 1976, 1978.

handling obscure hymns. Among the monographs written on individual deities mention should be made of E. Arbman's *Rudra* (1922), M.S. Gladstone's *Viṣṇu in the Ṛgveda* (1928), S.D. Atkins's *Puṣan in the Ṛgveda* (1941), H. Lüders's *Varuṇa* (2 vols., 1951, 1959), M. Riemschneider's *Der Wettergott* (1956), F. Cumont's *The Mysteries of Mithra* (1956), P. Thieme's *Mitra and Aryaman* (1957), etc. The studies of A.B. Keith,[118] B.K. Ghosh[119] and R.N. Dandekar[120] were also equally important.

A critical study on the merits and demerits of the approaches towards the Vedic divinities was found in H.D. Bhattacharyya's *The Foundations of the Living Faiths: An Introduction to Comparative Religion* (1938, pp. 151–201) which was delivered as the Stephenos-Nirmalendu Ghosh lecture conducted by the Calcutta University. J. Gonda's Dutch work on Vedic gods came out in 1943 in which a new line of interpretation which characterised his later works was foreshadowed. A sophisticated anthropological-cum-linguistic study with historical and philosophical awareness was found in J. Przyluski's *La grande de'esse: Introduction a l'etude comparative des religions* (1950) in which the influence of magical beliefs and practices in shaping religious, ritualistic and mythological ideas, the distinction of religious and apparently religious though irreligious themes, the transition from mother-right to father-right and its impact on the cults and rituals, especially on the goddess cults were reviewed. H.L. Hariyappa's *Ṛgvedic Legends through the Ages* (1953) served a twofold purpose. Ever since the beginnings of the Vedic study scholars were interested to see the ramifications of Vedic myths and legends, their various developments, in subsequent Indian literature. The author of this work had not only dealt with the source and phyla of the known ones but also traced the source of a hitherto unstudied later legends to the *Ṛgveda*. Hans Raj's *Physical and Scientific Interpretation of Aryan Mythology* (1957) was another important work in which the principles of comparative mythology were so modified as to uphold an unsophisticated Indian point of

[118]'The God Varuṇa' (*IHQ*, 1933), 'Indra and Vṛtra' (*Ind. Cult.*, 1935), 'The Origin of Aryan Gods' (*JRAS*, 1933, 1937), 'Varuṇa and Ouranos' (*Ind. Cult.*, 1937–38).

[119]Varuṇa (*JGIS*, 1941), 'Birth of the Gods' (*Ind. Cult.*, 1940).

[120]'Asura Varuṇa' (*ABORI*, XXI, 1939–40), 'Puṣan the Pastoral god of the Veda' (*New Ind. Ant.*, 1942), 'New Light on the Vedic God Savitṛ' (*ABORI*, XX, 1938–39), 'Viṣṇu in the Veda' (*P.V. Kane Vol.*, 1941), 'Rudra' (*AIOC*, XII, 1943–44), etc. These have been collected in his *Vedic Mythological Tracts*, Delhi, 1979.

view. A.B. Purani's *Studies in Vedic Interpretations* (1963) dealt with such diverse topics as the *Nirukta*, the concept of Ṛta, Satya, Sarasvatī, Urvasī, Seven Rivers, Yāska, Sāyaṇa, Purohita, Vedic words and so on. D.D. Kosmabi's *Myth and Reality* (1962) dealt with the myth of Urvasī and Pururavas (*RV*, X.95). His conclusion that Pururavas was killed at a sacrifice after having begotten a son on Urvasī was influenced by Grassmann's theory that the phrases in the said hymn such as *punar astam parehi, mṛtyubandhuḥ*, 'going to a far distance', 'lying down in the lap of Nirṛti' and so on were familiar idiomatic circumlocations of death. A new dimension in the study of the symbolism and suggestivity of various allusions and technical terms associated with Vedic myths, legends and rituals was reached in the works of Sadasiva A. Dange whose methodology comprised a structural study of the language as the primary key of understanding and a secondary comparative study. He wrote in Marathi as well. His papers on Yātu and Yātudhāna, Garua, Kadru, Prajāpati, Indra myths, Soma, Savitṛ, Apālā, bull, horse, cosmic foetus and similar other topics were published in celebrated Indological journals. His *Pastoral Symbolism from the Ṛgveda* (1970) was a significant contribution which had a sociological perspective as well. Among his other works the *Vedic Concept of 'Field' and the Divine Fructification* (1971) and *Sexual Symbolism in Vedic Ritual* (1979) offered a new approach in interpreting the apparently unintelligible but allegorical terms and concepts associated with various myths and rituals found in the Vedic texts. The three works taken together had more or less the same topic put under investigation: the sexual imagery and ritualism. In the first one Dange introduced the topic of sexual imagery of the Ṛgvedic *mantras* as a charm for the gain of rain and the fructification of the land. The second one made a closer study of some problematic hymns and the author came to the conclusion that the Ṛgvedic hymn reflected certain lost rituals in a number of cases and also that sex and sexual imagery were at the bare of the awkward looking expression. In the third book greater probe into the matter was made with reference to the later Saṃhitās as well to see if a continuous strain existed on the basis of which a methodology of ritual-sex could be established. According to Dange a thorough study of the method of sexual-coupling (*mithunikaraṇa*) in the later Vedic texts helps to understand the 'riddle' in certain of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*. Sindhu S. Dange had also published a good number of

papers pertaining to the interpretation of myths and rituals associated with various Vedic deities and objects.

J. de Marquette's *Introduction to Comparative Mysticism* (1949) offered a new approach to the study of Vedic religion in terms of mysticism. Although there had been no doubt as to what constituted the phenomena to which history and philosophy gave the name of *mysticism*, there were almost as many definitions of the term as there were writers on the subject. Hence it was not difficult to trace mysticism in the Vedas; but the difficulty lay elsewhere. Thomas Aquinas defined mysticism as *cognito dei experimentalis* or 'the knowledge of God through experience'. Rufus Jones in his *Studies in Mystical Religion* (1904) defined the subject as follows: "I shall use the word to express the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute intense and living stage". But the act of personal experience, as is found in abundance in the Vedic texts and illustrated in K.N. Davi's *Discoveries in Vedic Mysticism* (1955), the systematic investigation and interpretation of which formed the task of all mystical speculation was of highly contradictory and even of paradoxical nature. In the hymns of the *Ṛgveda* there is no lack of communion between the gods and the poets; the *yajñas* in the Brāhmaṇa literature could coerce the gods to bring them in relation to men; in the Upaniṣads the *ātman* in the inmost heart of the individual is same as the Brahman. But to stigmatise these ideas as mystic relations would appear to serve more to obscure the nature of the question than to clarify it. Again, there are certain types of works which, though appear as somewhat mystic in form, are not really so. Such works mostly reveal the interpreter's half-baked knowledge, but in certain rare cases they amount to almost a co-creation, a new set of ideas running parallel to the older ones, as is observed in the case of Sri Aurobindo's *Le Secret du Veda* (1955) and *On the Vedas* (1956). To what extent the interpretation of Aurobindo was mystic is difficult to say, though some liked to take it as such. For example, M.P. Pandit in his *Aditi and other Deities of the Veda* (1958) had tried to suggest an auto-interpretation of the Vedic deities with an 'esoteric' approach which he claimed to be in accordance with Aurobindo's 'mystic' understanding of the Vedas. This shows that attitude towards mysticism also varies from person to person and subjective exegesis can also pass for mystic interpretation. Though T.G. Mainkar in his *Mysticism in the Ṛgveda* (1961) had drawn our attention to the fact that scholars like M. Bloomfield, S.N. Dasgupta and M. Winternitz were not opposed to the idea of interpreting some of the aspects of the Vedic religion in terms of mysticism and that he had laboured much to identify the ritualistic mystics, philosophical mystics and typical mystics whose chief concern was to have divine experience from nature, love and beauty, yet it will be a mistake to assume that the whole of what we call mysticism was identical with that personal experience which was realised in the state of ecstasy or otherwise. The writers on Vedic mysticism had also overlooked the fact that mysticism was a definite stage in the historical development of religion and made its appearance under certain well defined conditions. It was not consistent with the formative period of the religio-philosophical ideas which was represented in the Vedic texts.

We do not want to mention all the publications of textual editions and translations done after 1930; but for the sake of historical justice at least a few should be mentioned. A new revised and critical edition of the *Ṛgveda* was done in five volumes (1933–51) by Sontake, Kashikar and others on behalf of the Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala of Poona. The discovery of the Paippalāda recension of the *Atharvaveda* by Durgamohan Bhattacharyya and its publication in 1964 was a remarkable achievement. It was Rudolf Roth who first found in Kashmir a mutilated brich-bark manuscript of this Paippalāda recension. The text of the manuscript, written in Śāradā script, very often corrupt and unintelligible, was reproduced by Maurice Bloomfield and Richard Garbe as early as in 1901. L.C. Barret transcribed the text of the Kashmirian manuscript into Roman characters and tried to make it to a certain extent intelligible.[121] Barret's text was again reproduced in Devanāgarī characters with some improvement by Raghuvira in three volumes.[122] In this context Durgamohan's discovery was indeed significant. The announcement of it was made in 1957,[123] and the first Kāṇḍa, edited from the original manuscripts with critical notes was published by Durgamohan himself in 1964 under the

[121] *JAOS*, XXVI, 197–295; XXX; 185–258; XXXII, 343–90; XXXV, 42–101.

[122] Vol. I, Kāṇḍas I–XIII, Lahore, 1936; vol. II, Kāṇḍas XIV–XVIII, Lahore, 1940; vol. III, Kāṇḍas XVIII–XX, Lahore, 1941.

[123] *Our Heritage*, V, 81–86; cf. *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Golden Jubilee Vol., 1961, 203–15.

title *Paippalāda Saṃhitā of the Atharvaveda*. The other Kāṇḍas were done by his son Dipak Bhattacharyya. Among other Vedic texts the edition of a *Kapiṣṭhala Kaṭha Saṃhitā* of the *Yajurveda* was edited by Raghuvira (1932) and the *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* by Vidhyadhara Sarma (1933–37). There were many editions and translations of the Upaniṣads. There is no need of mentioning all of them, except S. Radhakrishnan's *Principal Upaniṣads*, edited with texts, translation and notes (1953).

The year 1930 saw the publication of P.V. Kane's first volume of the *History of Dharmaśāstra*. This project in five volumes (actually seven, the second and fifth ones having two parts each) was completed in 1962. Though mainly devoted to the legal traditions which had their culminations in the Dharmaśāstras or Smṛtis, Kane dealt exhaustively with the Śrutis (the Vedic texts) as well for the setting up of the background of the topics he had dealt with which comprised almost all the aspects of the ancient Indian life in their totality. The Vedic texts, especially the later Saṃhitās, Brāhmaṇas and the Dharma, Śrauta and Gṛhya Sūtras were subjected to critical analysis for establishing links between the earlier and later traditions in regard to religious beliefs and faiths, rituals and sacraments and various aspects of social life which were never detached from religion. The *yajñas* received the most elaborate treatment in this work in which the Brāhmaṇas and the Śrauta Sūtras had been thoroughly utilised. The same held good in the case of other Śrauta rituals. Among other important works, P.S. Deshmukh's *Origin and Development of Religion in Vedic Literature* (1933) aimed at reconstructing the gradual crystallization of religious ideas scattered throughout the Vedic texts from a syncretistic point of view without any special theoretical preoccupation. P.E. Dumont's *L'Agnihotra* (1939) was a comparative and at the same time highly objective analysis of the most important Vedic ceremonial in which the ancient conception of maintaining various forms of fire and its utilitarian, ritualistic and psychological background were described in detail. V.M. Apte's *Social and Political Life in the Gṛhyasūtras* (1939) although did not fall within the category of religious study, contained information on religious life and the influence of religious ideas on society and state. In a subsequent publication, which was of course heavily drawn on this work, Apte had dealt with religious life as found in the Gṛhya Sūtras.

H.J. Narahari's *Ātman in the pre-Upaniṣadic Vedic Literature* (1944) was an important contribution to the field of religio-philosophical studies. Although most Upaniṣadic scholars dealt with this subject and sought to trace the roots of Upaniṣadic ideas in early Vedic literature, Narahari's work was a comprehensive treatment in which, apart from the relevant passages, the views of the earlier scholars were also presented, Swami Madhavananda's *Vedic Culture* was published by the Calcutta University in 1949. It contained discussions on the Vedic Ṛṣis, age of the Vedas, cow-killing, Devas and Mānavas, lore of bliss, Śiva cult and the Śiva-Śakti concept in the Vedas. It also contained an interesting study of the names of the Vedic Ṛṣis. N.J. Shende made an extensive study on the *Atharvaveda*, the results of which were published in two of his works. The first was *The Foundation of Atharvanic Religion* which was published by the Deccan College Research Institute in 1949. In this work he had systematised all the so called primitive or magical elements, rather what should be best described as the elements of *lokāyata* or popular culture, which formed the most essential ingredient of the religion of the *Atharvaveda* and demonstrated how these elements contributed to subsequent manifestations of ideas and practices in a higher level. It also served as the groundwork of his next attempt—*The Religion and Philosophy of the Atharvaveda* (1952)—which dealt with a variety of topics such as medicine, erotic, statecraft, Gṛhya or domestic rites, social and domestic practices, witchcraft, sacrifice, development of the concept of *brahman*, the Upaniṣadic ideas as foreshadowed in the *Atharvaveda* and the Atharvanic Upaniṣads. Another important work on *Atharvaveda* was V.W. Karambelkar's *The Atharvavedic Civilization* (1959).

K.R. Potdar's *Sacrifice in the Ṛgveda* (1953) was a continuation of the line of research initiated by Hillebrandt, Lévi, Keith, Kane and others. It was of descriptive and interpretative character which insisted more on the objective analysis of the ritualistic contents of the *Ṛgveda*. Louis Renou's *Vedic India* (Eng. trans. by Philip Spratt) was published in 1957 which dealt with the cultural traits of the Vedic age under a few categories like Texts (which provided a general idea of the nature and contents of the Vedic texts from the *Ṛgveda* to the Sūtras), Beliefs (which dealt with religion in general and deities in particular), Speculation (which dealt with the philosophical ideas), and Rituals (which included public rites like the grand sacrifices and domestic rites performed by the individuals).

Ram Gopal's *India of Vedic Kalpasūtras* (1959) earned a great reputation among the scholars for its special treatment which aimed at linking the passages of the Sūtras literature with the earlier Vedic texts, besides the usual presentation of their informative aspects. G.G. Mukherjee's *Studies in the Upaniṣad* (1960) was aimed at the understanding of the Upaniṣadic ideas from the modern philosophical point view, the first part of which 'the goal' was treated in two chapters dealing respectively with the problem of reality and with that of knowledge; the second part under the title 'the way' was treated in four chapters, the first and second of which dealt respectively with preparation and contemplation while the third and the fourth with the synthetic and analytic ways. The concluding portion dealt with the problem of attainment. Jan Fey's *An Enquiry into the Upaniṣadic Basic Insight* (1976) was based on a new perspective suggestive of a renovated Western interest in the field of Upaniṣadic studies.

VI

In the concluding section we like to deal with a few more important works which attempted to interpret the contents of the Vedas in terms of modern anthropological, sociological and psychological theories, including Marxism, along with certain new fangled approaches to the study of religion. There were some works in which attempts were made to trace the social basis of the Vedic religion. D.D. Kosambi (1956) held that the Brahmanical culture originated from the Vedas and the non-Brahmanical culture of the masses had a mutual assimilation which was responsible for the extraordinary cultural continuity of India, notwithstanding violent breaks known to have occurred in the political superstructure. He also said that the Vedas did not represent a homogeneous cultural tradition. J.C. Heesterman's study of the Rājasūya sacrifice (1957) combined Gonda's linguistics and Durkheim's sociology and as such it was able to change the traditional perspective.[124] More specific from the Marxian viewpoint was Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (1959) whose purpose was to understand the entire primitive complex as directly interwoven with the productive activity of men living evidently at a primitive level of development. He attempted to illustrate this postulation with reference to the Vedic literature which he considered to be really opposed to the popular

[124] *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, The Hague, 1957

tradition. He argued that inspite of all idealistic grandeur with which the world view of the Vedas was characterised, its subsoil was formed by some kind of proto-materialism representing a stage of pre-spiritual consciousness.[125] To a certain extent, though with reservations, the approach of Debiprasad was taken into account by N.N. Bhattacharyya (1975)[126] who analysed three principal Vedic rituals of royal inauguration (Aśvamedha, Rājasūya and Vājapeya) and held that they exhibited, in their fabricated forms, how with the social changes caused by the production of surplus and the accumulation of wealth by raids and wars, the ancient democratic institutions were destroyed, how the tribal chiefs came to acquire more power which led to the origin of kingship and how the rise of state power, symbolised by the annihilation of Ṛta, ruthlessly exterminated the traditional social relations. He also made a distinction between the original and sophisticated forms of the Vedic *yajñas*, their genesis in primitive magical beliefs and practices, their getting ensnared by the logic of pure illusion and their final culmination into the exclusive affair of the priests, kept shrouded in deep mystery and zealously guarded. Bruce Lincoln (1981) studied the Indo-Iranian religion from the viewpoint of linguistics and comparative mythology, but he had taken into account the socio-economic, anthropological and ecological features as well, by which some interesting formulations linking religious beliefs and social organisation had come into light.[127]

P.L. Bhargava's *India in the Vedic Age* (1970), though it had no special sociological bias, contributed to a better understanding of Vedic religion and philosophy to which a chapter (XIV) was devoted, because of its groundwork, the well devised historical outline, in which the vast mass of materials were presented. C. Chakravarti's *Common Life in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda: An Account of the Folklore of the Vedic Period* (1977) was a novel project which attempted to restore the subaltern beliefs and practices forming the subsoil of Vedic religion. The small volume of Carsten Bregenhoj's *Ṛgveda as the Key to Folklore: An Imagery Experiment* (Eng. trans. by Martha G. Abrahamsen, Finland, 1987) should also be mentioned in this connection. G.S. Ghurye's *Vedic India* (1979) was another important work, the main purpose of which was to throw

[125] *Lokāyata*, Delhi, 1959.

[126] *Ancient Indian Rituals*, New Delhi, 1975.

[127] *Priests, Warriors and Cattle*, Berkeley, 1981

light on the Vedic social complexes which were directly connected with various aspects of the life of people belonging to different cultural grades, which he separated with meticulous endeavour from the Vedic texts. Among numerous topics discussed in this volume, religion was given a reasonable space. Unlike other historians who wanted to discover the social infrastructure of the Vedic religion, he made no generalisation taking the religious complex in its totality. His treatment of the Vedic religion was selective. He had taken into account only a few aspects—apparently simple but amply suggestive—such as the horse or bull complex and the like (cf. the unvailing of such symbolic items by Sadasiva and Sindhu Dange) certain Vedic ideas vis-à-vis the functional aspects of worship, origin and development of the concept of a few selected Vedic deities—such as Viṣṇu or Śiva and so on—seeking to explain the rationale of their emergence in a given space and time, and dealt with all these in terms of a carefully cultivated sociological outlook. Padma Misra's *Evolution of the Brāhmaṇa Class* (1978)—in the perspective of Vedic priesthood—sought to trace the evolution of a sacerdotal caste among the Vedic people through a semantic study of four key words applied to the priestly functionaries in the *Ṛgveda*, namely, *vipra, ṛṣi, purohita* and *brahman*. Although she did not deny the probability of the existence of the priestly class, she also affirmed at the same time that this class in the Ṛgvedic age was yet to crystallize. Analysing the aforesaid terms in their proper perspective she pointed out that it was difficult to sustain J. Gonda's objections to tracing a semantic evolution of these terms as the Vedic literature provided unmistakable evidence of tremendous changes in the spheres of thought, ritual and mythology.

Since 1948 P.E. Dumont published numerous papers on the Vedic sacrificial cults.[128] The Brāhmaṇa literature which was the storehouse of ritualism was specially studied by A.C. Banerjee (1963),[129] G.V. Devasthali (1965),[130] Jogiraj Basu (1969)[131] and Umakant Thite (1975).[132] The Sūtra literature[133] and also Vedic

[128] *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 1948–69.

[129] *Studies in the Brāhmaṇas*, Calcutta, 1963.

[130] *Religion and Mythology in the Brāhmaṇas*, Pune, 1965.

[131] *India in the Age of the Brāhmaṇas*, Calcutta, 1969.

[132] *Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa Texts*, Pune, 1975.

[133] S.C. Banerji's *Dharmasūtras: A Study of Their Origin and Development*, Calcutta, 1962, has been a fundamental work long since. R.N. Sharma's *Culture and Civilization as revealed in the Śrautasūtras* (1977) was a thorough and indepth study in a less excavated branch of Vedic literature while S.C. Chakravarti's *Paribhāṣās in the Śrautasūtra* (1980) fulfilled a long-felt want of a terminological glossary which was essential for the understanding of various aspects of later Vedic religion.

literature in general[134] drew the attention of modern scholars. Naama Drury's study of the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (1981), specially in relation to the sacrificial cults was based on the Jungian psychology in the field of archetypes and symbols as was revealed in the author's treatment of the Agniṣṭoma, Aśvamedha and Agnicayana rituals.[135] The cult and ritual of fire which was considered to be the most primitive aspect of the Indo-European religion had been taken up by a good number of modern scholars as special subjects of their study. C. Blair's *Heat in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda* (1961) was a study of conceptual and ritual symbolism which was the precursor of many a study in this field. An elaborate and documentary work on this cult was made by Fritz Staal in two volumes (1984) with numerous photographs and two cassettes under a self-explanatory title.[136] Among other important works, Dipak Bhattacharyya's *Mythological and Ritual Symbolism: A Study with reference to the Vedic and Tantric Agni* (1984) was a thought-provoking work in which stray myths in relation to Agni were collected, their development from the *Ṛgveda* to the *Atharvaveda* outlined and their metamorphosis in the Tantras reviewed. Special emphasis was laid in this work on the conformity of myth with sacrifice as one would find in the Vedic *āgnyadheya* and in Tantric *agnijanana* and on Tantric restructuring and soteriology. The ritual, mythology and thought-complex associated with the cult of fire were also dealt with in David Knipe's *In the Image of Fire: The Vedic Experience of Heat*, the work which we have already had the occasion to refer. Another work of this category was Uma Marina Vesci's *Heat and Sacrifice in the Vedas* (1988) which was based mostly on the *Śatapatha* and *Taittirīya* Brāhmaṇas and the Śrautasūtras. In this work the authoress was able to identify the main thread of symbolism of sacred fire as conceived in the Vedic texts with special reference to *paśuyajña* (animal sacrifice) *agnyādhāna* (first kindling of the sacrificial fire

[134] Satya Sarva's *Comprehensive History of Vedic Literature* (1977) was a descriptive account of the contents of the Brāhmaṇa and Āraṇyaka texts. Among later publications G.N. Sastri's *History of the Vedic Literature* (1982) may also be mentioned.

[135] *The Sacrificial Ritual in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Delhi, 1981.

[136] *Agni: The Vedic Ritual of Fire*, Delhi, 1984.

by a householder), *agnicayana* (construction of fire altar) and *pravargya* (ceremony introductory to Soma sacrifice). While in the case of the earlier studies the main emphasis was upon providing the rationale of the mythological and ritualistic elements and tracing the formation of logical sequences in the subsequent process of their development recent works tended to insist on the functional analysis of specific mythological or ritualistic phenomena in terms of a variety of complex principles.

Louis Renou's *Destiny of the Veda in India* came out in 1965. It was a masterly work, the subject matter of which, though did not tally with the title, comprised mostly the exposition of different points of view—ancient medieval and modern—about the Veda and its relation to the vast Sanskrit literature that developed under its impact.[137] V.G. Paranjpe's *Vedic Religion* (according to the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*) in two volumes (1969–71) and J. Varenne's *La religion Vedique* (1970)[138] were important modern publications on Vedic religion. While in the former, the emphasis was on the study of details in which every aspect of the Vedic deities and their mythology, the development of abstractions in their concepts, the growth of philosophical speculations and ritualistic ingredients was studied in full length, the latter sought to offer an interpretative approach in order to convey a meaningful account of the Vedic religion in an historical perspective intended mostly for the non-specialists. Sukumari Bhattacharji's *The Indian Theogony* (1970) was a comparative study of Indian mythology from the Vedas to the Purāṇas. It dealt with the Vedic components and their subsequent ramifications which constituted the triad of classical Indian mythology—Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva. The first part of this work dealt with the gods of the Śiva group which, according to the authoress, comprised the Vedic Varuṇa, Yama and Rudra-Śiva; the second part with the gods of the Viṣṇu group which comprised the Vedic solar gods, the Aśvins, Indra, Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa; and the third part with gods of the Brahman group which comprised Brahmanaspati,

[137]N.N. Law's *The Age of the Ṛgveda* (1965) was an historical study in which various views on the subject was examined and analysed. Anirvan's *Veda Mimāṃsā* (1965) was considered to be a monumental contribution to the Vedic study in Bengali, but it was no more than a useful collection of the known views mingled with the author's auto-interpretation. R.V. Dattaray's *Vedicism in Bengal* (1974) also belonged to the category of historical study.

[138]*Enc. de Pleiade Hist. des. Rel.*, I, Paris, 1970, 577 ff.

Bṛhaspati, Tvaṣṭṛ, Viśvakarman, Prajāpati, Puruṣa, Virāj, Hiraṇyagarbha, etc. The way in which the gods of the Vedic pantheon—many of whom were recognisably related to other Indo-European gods—were changed over time and with the cultural and social needs of the population they served, were traced in broad outline. In dealing with the metamorphosis of the Vedic pantheon Sukumari banked on the comparative mythology, especially on the methodology of multi-disciplinal approach outlined by Mirca Eliade and with the parallels between Indian and non-Indian myths on the approach of Claude Lévi Strauss who held that diffusion within the limits of historical probability should be the natural explanation of similarities in myths of different areas.

N.N. Bhattacharyya's *History of Indian Cosmogonical Ideas* (1971) attempted to systematise the diverse cosmogonical theories found in the Vedic literature. Vedic cosmogony was previously handled by Wallis and Geldner, and subsequently by Keith and Brown.[139] Dr. Sampurnanand's *Cosmogony in Indian Thought* (1942) contained aspects of Vedic cosmogony in the sequence of Indian cosmogonical tradition as a whole. Bhattacharyya classified the Vedic cosmogonical theories into three broad categories, namely, those beginning with the material principles, those beginning with the divine principles and those beginning with the abstract principles. These categories again had sub-categories revealing intermediary stages of development and their mutual interactions created anthropomorphised forms leading to more concrete divine and abstract superdivine creative principles. He also dealt with the impact of the Vedic cosmogonical theories on the later systems of Indian religion and philosophy. Bhattacharyya's work was mainly historical, aimed at outlining the process of the development of cosmogonical ideas from rudimentary creative principles to more refined and broader perspectives at different stages of the evolution of Indian thought. Glimpses of Vedic cosmology were found in R.F. Gombrich's article in *Ancient Cosmologies* (1975, ed. Blacker and Loewe). S.S. Bhattacharjee's *The Hindu Theory of Cosmology* (1978) contains informations on Vedic cosmology and cosmogony but the purpose of the author was to make their evaluation in terms of modern scientific ideas. The subsequent work on this subject was made by Babu Ram Yadava under the title *Vedic Cosmog-*

[139]For Wallis, Geldner and Keith see *supra*. Norman Brown, 'Theories of Creation in the Ṛgveda' in *JAOS*, LXXXV, 1965, 23–32.

ony (1983) who concentrated more on the detailed study of the cosmogonical contents as found in the Vedic texts providing interpretations from various sources as well.

J. Gonda's indepth study on *The Vedic God Mitra* (1972) and *The Dual Deities in the Religion of the Veda* (1974) differed from the approaches of the earlier scholars like Dumezil, Cumont, Thieme and others who emphasised on comparative mythology which was supposed to provide excellent scope for study on this particular deity. But Gonda attached to comparative mythology a secondary importance and insisted primarily on projecting the god and interpreting the facts and allusions associated with him on what transpired from a critical textual analysis. J.R. Joshi's *Some Minor Divinities in Vedic Mythology and Ritual* (1977) was also an important contribution from the viewpoint of historical analysis without any special theoretical preoccupation. We have already had the occasion to refer to the papers of R.N. Dandekar a few of which were published in a book form in 1979 under the title *Vedic Mythological Tracts*. It dealt with the myths relating to Indra, Agni, Savitṛ, Pūṣaṇa, Viṣṇu, Varuṇa, Rudra-Śiva, Vasiṣṭha and Yama along with an appendix dealing with the study of Vedic mythology. As a lifelong Vedic scholar, and one who was conversant with different trends of Western methodology. Dandekar had developed his own approach which upheld a unique Indian point of view based on internal comparison of textual matters, a reflection of which was also found in the works of Sadasiva A. Dange. Ronald W. Neufeldt's *Max Müller and the Ṛgveda: A Study of Its Role in His Work and Thought* (1980) attempted an intensive analysis of the works of Max Müller on linguistics, religion and mythology vis-à-vis the *Ṛgveda*, to the study of which he assigned a key role through which along one could probe the earliest germs of human thought and discover the stage prior to the development of Greek mythology, ancient Judaism and Zoroastrianism, with special emphasis on his views on the *Ṛgveda*, the evolution of its prosody, the nature of its language, and the conception and evolution of its deities, their growth and relative importance. Though not in the same line, in a more recent work entitled *Modern Commentators of the Veda* (1985) A.K. Patreia endeavoured to make a comparative study of the views and interpretations of Max Müller, Dayānanda and Sri Aurobindo.

U.P. Arora's *Motifs in Indian Mythology: Their Greek and Other Parallels* (1981) dealt with a few selected motifs from the Vedas, the

Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads (also there were a few from the epics) in terms of their parallels in mythologies of different parts of the world. The author differentiated 'myth' from analogous terms and discussed various approaches to its study, ancient and modern, defined the term 'motif' in close dependence with the definitions provided by modern folklorists, and then after offering the parallelisms concluded that "many of the legends which Indian mythology shares with other nations of the world are explainable by a simple fact of similar response of human mind everywhere". Vedic mythology was subsequently treated by Usha Choudhuri in her *Indra and Varuṇa in Indian Mythology* (1981), the purpose of which was to convey facts in historical sequence and establish link between the earlier and later traditions. W.D. O'Flaherty's[140] *Sexual Metaphors and Animal Symbols in Indian Mythology* (1981) threw new light on the mythical androgynes, especially on the androgynes of beasts in the sphere of the Vedic mythology, apart from other themes connected with sexuality or endowed with sexual overtones. Various objects symbolising sexual pairs and sexual allusions to various fluids were taken into account in terms of a new methodology, the tool-box method (the use of any tool to open a myth), as the authoress herself called it. Accordingly to her, "myth is like a palimpsest on which generation after generation has engraved its own layer of message". Doris Srinivasan's *Concepts of Cow in the Ṛgveda* was an indepth study which combined the aspects of mythology, symbolism, sociology and other viewpoints on a particular item and the results thus obtained provide a wider perspective to the understanding of the Vedic way of life. K.S. Macdonald's *On the Creed and Practice of the Indo-Aryans* (1982) was an important addition to the historical literature of the Vedic religion. The first part of John E. Mitchner's *Traditions of the Seven Ṛṣis* (1982) dealt with the conceptualization of the personalities of the seven mythical sages, originally stellar deities, from the Vedic Kalpasūtras tracing their origins to the Upaniṣads, Brāhmaṇas and Saṃhitās and their subsequent evolution in the epics and Purāṇas.

The Vedic Experience: Mantra Mañjarī (1983) was a voluminous anthology of the Vedas which was edited by R. Panikkar in collaboration with N. Shanta, M. Rogers, B. Baumer and M. Bidoli. Meant for

[140]Her other works in which Vedic sources have also been utilised are *Asceticism and Sexuality in the Mythology of Śiva*, Oxford, 1973; *Hindu Myths*, Harmondsworth, 1975; *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*, Berkeley, 1976.

educated laymen, it contained lucid translations of the important and interesting portions of the Vedic literature from the *Ṛgveda* to the Upaniṣads. Apart from a comprehensive introduction outlining the main features of the contents of Vedic literature, there were short introductions to every section and subsections and even to important hymns which made the volume indeed very useful to all kinds of readers. The *Sāmaveda* was edited and translated by S.V. Gaṇapati (1983). The *Ṛgvidhāna* was likewise edited and translated by M.S. Bhat under the title *Vedic Tantrism* (1987). Vidyanand Sarasvati's *Vedic Concept of God* (1983) was an expository work on the subjective line which should fall in the category of the general works on the Vedas. A.K. Lahiri's *Vedic Vṛtra* (1984) was an important recent addition to the Vedic mythological studies. We have already had the occasion to notice how this Vṛtra phenomenon attracted the earlier Vedic scholar and to note numerous works on the Indra-Vṛtra myths. The present work was characterised by its comprehensiveness in which the results of the earlier studies were accommodated and reviewed along with the author's own interpretation transpiring from historical analysis. Wayne Howard's *Vedic Recitation in Vārāṇasī* (1986) was a very novel production in which the demonstrative aspects of the recitation were outlined with reference to selected verses, their accent, acoustics, augmentation and diminution, melody, notation and other aspects had been described technically. W. Edward Hale's *Asura in Early Vedic Religion* (1986) was also aimed at giving a similar type of comprehensiveness to the earlier works on this subject. It had long been acknowledged that although in the Indian tradition the Asuras were defamed and relegated to the inferior position of the demons, even to the extent of *arthaviparyaya* or change of meaning of the term itself, in the earlier Vedic texts their position was different and that the Asuras probably represented a religious tradition of Iranian background in which Varuṇa was the chief deity as opposed to the Indra-worshipping Daivas of India. That is why the Asura elements could not entirely be hushed up in the Vedic literature, and much light was thrown on this obscure chapter by the early Vedic scholars as had already been observed. Hale's work attempted to present a complete picture of the situation. It began with the criticism of the earlier views of various scholars and proceeded on to describe the previous theories, Asura in the *Ṛgveda* and subsequent Vedic literature, derivatives and compounds of Asura from the entire Vedic

literature, selected chapters on the Rākṣasa, Dasyus and Dāsas, and an important appendix on Ahura in *Avesta*.

Among other recent publications, Usha Grover's *Symbolism in the Araṇyakas and Their Impact on the Upaniṣads* (New Delhi, 1987) provided an indepth textual analysis in order to demonstrate the historical process through which concepts and imageries of a certain stage of Vedic thinking acquired new dimension at a subsequent stage, throwing more light on the undefined demarcation line between the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads, both chronologically and thematically. P.C. Mukhopadhyay's *Journey of the Upaniṣads to the West* (Calcutta, 1987) was another significant contribution attempting to evaluate the influence of the Upaniṣads on Western mind. The first part of the book was devoted to the Upaniṣadic doctrines—their genesis, development and culmination—and the second part to the impact of the Upaniṣads on the ideas of the Western philosophers like Schelling, Bruno, Nicolas Malebranche, Spinoza, etc. A big chapter comprising about 56 pages was devoted to Schopenhauer. The Upaniṣadic influence on Madame Blavatsky was also demonstrated. Among the poets and thinkers, Wordsworth, Shelly, Emerson, Whitman, La Martin, Hugo and others were taken into account. The attempt is undoubtedly laudable, but it is difficult to say whether superficial resemblances really mean something.

CHAPTER 3

Studies on Buddhism

I

Ernst Windisch's work on Indian philology and literature (1917–21) contains informations on Buddhist studies in Europe in the first half of the nineteenth century. Since then there were many stray attempts to present the results of the studies in different fields of Buddhism from time to time. Henri de Lubac in his *La recontre du bouddhisme et de l'Occident* (1952) has given the history of the meeting of Buddhism and the West. E. Conze in his *Thirty Years of Buddhist Research* (1967) has made a critical evaluation of the main trends of researches relating to the formation of the Buddhist Canon, the problems connected with pre-Aśokan Buddhism and the inadequacies in the field of Mahāyānic studies. William Peiris's *The Western Contribution to Buddhism* (1973) gives biographical sketches of the Western scholars who, over a period of one and a half century, have made a distinct contribution towards the furtherance of Buddhist studies. This book also takes into account the impact of these scholars on the modern Western thought and gives a list of the complete publications of the Pali Text Society. The next important work is J.W. de Jong's *Brief History of Buddhist Studies in Europe and America* (1976). The first chapter of this book deals briefly with the earlier Western knowledge about Buddhism as gleaned from different sources. Greater details have been furnished in relation to Buddhist studies between 1826 and 1877 in which Burnouf was the dominating figure. The second chapter begins in 1877 and ends about 1942. This period witnessed the works of such great scholars as Sylvain Lévi, Vallee Poussin, H. Oldenberg, Th. Stcherbatsky and the Rhys Davids couple. The third chapter deals with the more recent period, while the final chapter sketches some of the tasks which will require the attention of scholars in coming years. The present author's *History of Researches on Indian Buddhism* (1981) is a classified survey of Buddhist studies covering a period of no less than 150 years (1825–1975). Its

introductory portion deals with the story of the beginnings of researches in Buddhism. The second chapter is under the title 'In Quest of a Historical Buddha and of His Original Teachings'. Other chapters are under the titles 'Studies in Buddhist Councils and Sects', 'Mahayanic Studies', 'Philosophical Studies', 'Studies on Tantric Buddhism', 'Studies on Central Asian Sources', 'The Pali Texts: Their Editions and Translations', 'Studies on Chinese and Tibetan Sources of Indian Buddhism', 'Epigraphical and Archaeological Studies', 'Studies in Buddhist Art and Iconography', 'Studies on Buddhism from Historical Viewpoint', and 'Studies on the Social and Functional Role of Buddhism'. The book also contains a subjectwise classified list of important works on Buddhism done between 1950 and 1975.[1]

II

According to Burnouf the first to mention Pali was Simon de la Loubére who visited Siam in 1687–88 as an envoy of Louis XIV.[2] In the last quarter of the eighteenth century William Chambers and J.Ph. Wesdin published a few notices on Pali.[3] The earliest known European to come to the East to study Pali was the Danish scholar R.K. Rask who reached Ceylon in 1821 where he studied not only Pali but also Simhalese and acquired a rich collection of palm-leaf manuscripts which formed part of the Rask collection in the Royal Danish Academy. In 1824 Benjamin Clough published from Colombo a book under the title *A Compendious Pali Grammar.* The

[1]The following articles are also to be noted in this connection: L.H. Hammerich, 'Studies of Buddhism in Denmark', *Mahābodhi*, LXX, 1962, 227–32; I.B. Horner, 'PTS's contribution to the Spread of Buddhism,' *Mahābodhi*, LXXIV, 1966, 101–11; A. Pyatgorsky, 'Buddhology in the USSR', *Mahābodhi*, LXXVI, 1968, 82 ff.; N. Dutt, 'Introduction to Pali Studies in India', *Mahābodhi*, LXXV, 1967, 138 ff.; A. Haldar, 'Buddhist Studies: A Brief Survey', *Buddhist Yearly*, 1968–69, 21 ff.; G.M. Bongard-Levin, 'On Buddhist Studies in USSR', *Journal of the Asiatic Society*, IX, 1969, 6 ff.; W.W. Schumann, 'Buddhism and Buddhist Studies in Germany', *Mahābodhi*, LXXIX, 1971, 57–64; J. Kolmas, 'Buddhist Studies in Czechoslovakia', *Bulletin of Tibetology*, IX, 1974, 5–10.

[2]In 1691 Loubère published *Description du royaume de Siam* which contained a translation of the life of Devadatta and an abstract of the *Pātimokkha*.

[3]Wesdin quoted in his *Systema brahmanicum* (1791) an Italian translation of the Kammavācā made from original Pali in 1776. Another translation was described by him in his catalogue of the manuscripts of the Valleuri Museum (1793). A third one was made in Burma by Father Vincente Sangermano, the English translation of which was published by Francis Buchanan Hamilton under the title 'On the Religion

study of Buddhism was really initiated in Europe after the publication of *Essai sur le Pali* in French by Eugene Burnouf and Christian Lassen in 1826. In 1837 George Turnour of the Ceylon Civil Service published his translation of the first 38 chapters of the *Mahāvaṃsa* with a few discourses of the Buddha as recorded in the Pali canon. Pali manuscripts were described by N.L. Westergaard in collaboration with Friedrich von Spiegel in the Catalogue of the Indian manuscripts of the Royal Library: *Codices indici Bibliothecae Regiae Havni ensis* (1846). The first Pali text published in Europe was F. Spiegel's *Anecdota Palica* (1845), the textual portion of which was printed in Devanāgarī characters. The credit of publishing the full text of the *Dhammapada* in Roman script with a Latin translation went to V. Fausböll (1855) which was subsequently rendered into German (1860).[4]

In 1869, R.C. Childers published the *Khuddaka-pāṭha* and this was followed by his publication of the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (1872–73) with text commentary and translation. Among other textual works published during this period mention should be made of I.P. Minayeff's Russian rendering of the extracts from the *Vinaya Piṭaka* (1870), J.F. Dickson's English translation of the *Pātimokkha* (1876, 1878), P. Grimbolt's extracts from the *Dīgha Nikāya* (1876), Oldenberg's translation of the *Dīpavaṃsa* (1878) and his edition of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* (1879–83),[5] T.W. Rhys Davids's English rendering of the *Nidānakathā* (1879), R. Pischel's *Assalāyana-sutta* (1880) and V. Trenckner's edition of the *Milindapañho* (1880). A certain number of Jātakas had been published between 1861 and 1872 by V. Fausböll, I.P. Minayeff and T.D. Alwis. Since then Fausböll had undertaken the publication of the entire collection, at first with R.C. Childers and then, after the premature death of the latter,

and Literature of the Burmas' in *Asiatic Researches*, 1799, VI, 136 ff. Its first direct English translation was made by Benjamin Clough in 1834. In 1841 F. Spiegel published the *Upasampadā Kammavācā* in Devanāgarī together with a Latin translation and notes. In 1844 Otto von Bohtlingk published the *Kaṭhina Kammāvācā*. Spiegel published three other Kammavācās in his *Anecdota Palica*, Leipzig, 1845, 68 ff.

[4]French translation of the *Dhammapada* by F. Huc (1878), L. Feer (1879), R. and M. de Maratray (1931); German by L.V. Schroeder (1892), K.E. Neumann (1893), W. Markgraf (1912), P. Dhalke (1919), R.O. Franke (1928); Italian by P.E. Pavolini (1908, 1912); Polish by St. Fr. Michalski-Iwienski (1925); English by Max Müller in *SBE*, X, part 1, A.J. Edmunds (1902), W.D.C. Wagiswara and K.J. Saunders (1912), C.A.R. Rhys Davids, PTS (1931).

[5]It was translated in parts by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (1881–85) in the 'Sacred Books of the Buddhists' series under the title *Vinaya Texts*.

with T.W. Rhys Davids. Fausböll was able to publish the standard edition of the Jātakas in six volumes between 1877 and 1897.

In 1881, T.W. Rhys Davids founded the Pali Text Society. In his own words: "The sacred books of the early Buddhists have preserved to us the sole record of the only religious movement in the world's history which bears any close resemblance to Christianity, and it is not too much to say that the publication of this unique literature will be no less important for the study of history and especially of religious history than the publication of the Vedas has always been." In a period of less than fifty years the PTS was able to publish almost the whole of the Pali canonical texts, a large number of Pali commentaries, about three dozen translations and some twenty issues of a journal containing learned articles on Buddhism and on Pali language and literature.[6]

The English translations of the Pali texts under the shadow of the PTS are as follows: *Vinaya*, I.B. Horner (1938–52);[7] *Dīgha*, T.W.

[6]A complete list of the PTS editions is given below: *Dīgha Nikāya*, T.W. Rhys Davids and J.E. Carpenter (1890, 1903, 1911); *Majjhima*, V. Treckner and R. Chalmers (1888–1902); *Saṃyutta*, L. Feer (1884–98); *Aṅguttara*, R. Morris and E. Hardy (1885–1900), A.K. Warder (1961); *Khuddaka-Pāṭha*, H. Smith and M. Hunt (1915); *Dhammapada*, S. Sumangala Thera (1914); *Udāna*, P. Steinthal (1885); *Itivuttaka*, W. Windisch (1889); *Suttanipāta*, V. Fausböll (1885, 1893), D. Anderson and H. Smith (1913); *Vimānavatthu*, E.R. Gooneratne (1886); *Petavatthu*, I.P. Minayeff (1888); *Thera* and *Therīgāthā*, H. Oldenberg and R. Pischel (1883); *Mahāniddesa*, Valleé Poussin and E.J. Thomas (1916–17); *Cullaniddesa*, W. Stede (1918); *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, A.C. Taylor (1905,1907); *Apadāna*, Mary E. Lilley (1925,1927); *Buddhavaṃsa* and *Cariyapiṭaka*, R. Morris (1882); *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, E. Muller (1885); *Vibhaṅga*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1904); *Dhātukathā*, E.R. Gooneratne (1892); *Pudgalapaññatti*, R. Morris (1893); *Kathāvatthu*, A.C. Taylor (1894,1897); *Yamaka*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids, et al. (1911–13); *Paṭṭhāna*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1906, 1921–23); *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, Rhys Davids, Carpenter and Stede (1886–1932); *Papañcasūdanī*, Woods, Kosambi and Horner (1922–38); *Sāratthappakāsinī*, Woodward (1929–37); *Manorathapūraṇī*, Walleser and Kopp (1924–26), Kopp (1964); *Paramatthajotika*, H. Smith (1915–18); *Paramatthadīpanī*, Muller, et al. 1893–1959); *Saddhammapajjotika*, A.P. Buddhadatta (1931–40); *Visuddhajanavilāsinī*, Godakumbura (1954); *Madhuratthavilāsinī*, Horner, (1946); *Samantapāsādikā*, Takakusu et al. (1924–47); *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, Maskell (1956); *Sammohavinodanī*, *Vimānaviniccaya*, *Uttaraviniccaya*, A.P. Buddhadatta (1923, 1928); *Milindaṭīkā*, Jaini (1961); *Abhidhammāvatāra*, Buddhadatta (1915); *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1884); *Mohavicchedanī*, Warder (1961); *Peṭakopadeśa*, A. Barua (1949); *Nettippakaraṇa*, Hardy (1902); *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā*, Norman (1906–14); *Visuddhimagga*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1920–21).

[7]German tr. K. Seidenstucker, 1924–25.

Rhys Davids (1899, 1910, 1921);[8] *Majjhima*, R. Chalmers (1926–27);[9] I.B. Horner (1954–59);[10] *Saṃyutta*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids and F.L. Woodward (1917,1922,1925);[11] *Aṅguttara*, F.L. Woodward and E.M. Hare (1932–36);[12] *Khuddakapāṭha*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1931);[13] *Dhammapada* (see *supra*, n.3); *Udāna*, D.M. Strong (1902), F.L. Woodward (1935);[14] *Itivuttaka*, Woodward (1935);[15] *Suttanipāta*, E.M. Hare (1944);[16] *Petavatthu* and *Vimānavatthu*, Kennedy and Gehman (1942); *Therā Therīgāthā*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1909, 1913);[17] *Buddhavaṃsa* and *Cariyapiṭaka*, B.C. Law (1938);[18] *Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1900);[19] *Pudgalapaññatti*, B.C. Law (1923);[20] *Kathāvatthu*, S.Z. Aung and C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1915);[21] *Paramatthajotika*, Nānamoli (1960);[22] *Samantapāsādikā*, Jayawickrama (1962);[23] *Atthasālinī*, P.M. Tin (1920–21);[24] *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, C.A.F. Rhys Davids (1910);[25] *Nettippakaraṇa* and

[8] *Dialogues of the Buddha*; selections in *SBE*, XI, 1 ff., 158 ff., 235 ff.; German: K.E. Neumann, 1907–18; R.O. Franke (selections) 1913; P.Dhalke, *Suttapiṭaka*, II (selections) 1920.

[9] *Further Dialogues of the Buddha*; selections in *SBE*, II.

[10] *The Middle Length Sayings*; German tr., Neumann, 1896–1902. P. Dhalke, op.cit., III, 1923; Italian tr., G.D. Lorenzo, 1907.

[11] *Book of Kindred Sayings*; German tr., W. Geiger, 1925.

[12] *The Book of Gradual Sayings*; also Gooneratne 1913, Jayasundara 1925; German tr., Bhikkhu Nānatiloka (Anton Gueth), 1911.

[13] *Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*; also R.C. Childers, 1870; F.L. Woodward, *Some Sayings of the Buddha*; Nānamoli, *The Minor Readings*, 1960; German tr., Seidenstucker, 1910.

[14] *Verses of Uplift*: German tr., Seidenstucker 1920; see also E. Windisch in *JPTS*, 1890,91 ff.; B.C. Majumdar in *JRAS*, 1911, 197 ff.

[15] Also J.H. Moore, New York, 1908; German tr., Seidenstucker, 1922; Italian tr., Pavolini, 1912.

[16] *Woven Cadences of the Early Buddhists*; also V. Fausböll in *SBE*, X, part II; Chalmers, HOS, 1932; German tr. Neumann, 1911.

[17] *Psalms of the Early Buddhists*, part I Sisters, part II Brethren.

[18] *Minor Anthologies*, III.

[19] *Buddhist Manual of Psychological Ethics*, rev. ed., 1923.

[20] German tr., Nānatiloka, 1910.

[21] *Points of Controversy*.

[22] *The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning*.

[23] *Inception of Discipline*, introductory part translated.

[24] *The Expositor*.

[25] *Compendium of Philosophy*.

Peṭakopadesa, Nānamoli (1962,1964);[26] *Visuddhimagga*, P.M. Tin (1922–31);[27] and *Milindapañho*, I.B. Horner (1963).[28]

Besides the PTS, other organisations came forward to publish the Pali texts. The Harvard Oriental Series published in 1896 copious extracts from the Pali canonical and literature, translated into English by H.C. Warren under the title *Buddhism in Translations*. From Harvard was published the English translation of the *Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā* (1921) and the *Suttanipāta* (1932) done respectively by Burlingame and Chalmers. The *Visuddhimagga* of Buddhaghoṣa, edited by Warren and Kosambi was also published by Harvard in 1950. In Srilanka the Vidyodaya Oriental College of Colombo (1872) and the Vidyālaṅkāra of Kelaniya (1873) had important contribution to Pali studies. Simon Hewavitarane, brother of the celebrated Anagarika Dharmapāla who founded the Mahabodhi Society in Srilanka in 1891, donated a large sum of money for printing and publishing Pali texts. Apart from the texts over 49 volumes of commentaries were published in the Simon Hewavitarane series. Scholars like L.C. Wijisinha, Widurapola Piyatissa, A.P. Buddhadatta, A.P. de Soyaza, Koliya Kassapa, H. Gabriel de Silva, B. Siri Sivali and others contributed a lot to the preparation of the Simhalese version of the *Tripiṭaka*. In Burma Nyaungyan Sayadaw (1874–1955) published 150 manuals on Buddhism. The Buddha Sasana Council of Burma edited afresh the whole of the *Tripiṭaka*. With materials supplied from different countries, the basic text, as recorded in 729 stone slabs at the Kuthodaw temple in Mandalay, was composed and a final text established. The volumes began to be published in succession since 1956. A complete edition of the *Tripiṭaka* in 39 volumes and in Siamese characters was printed by the order of King Culālaṅkaraṇa in 1894 from Bangkok. In 1925 an edition of the Jātakas in 10 volumes and that of *Milindapañho*, all in Siamese characters, were issued and in subsequent years as many as 45 volumes of the *Tripiṭaka*, 30 volumes of the *Aṭṭhakathās* and 10 volumes of the *Prakaraṇas* had been published in Siamese script.

[26] *The Guide; Piṭaka Disclosure*.

[27] Also Nānamoli, *The Path of Purification*, Colombo, 1956; German tr., Nānatiloka, 1931–36.

[28] Original ed. V. Treckner, 1880; Eng. tr. T.W. Rhys Davids in *SBE*, XXXV–XXXVI; German tr., F.O. Schrader, 1905, Nānatiloka, 1919; French tr., L. Finot, 1923.

The Buddhist Institute of Pnom-Penh (Kampuchea) founded in 1930 undertook the task of preparing and publishing Pali texts and their Kampuchean translations and accordingly it published 110 volumes. The work of translating the Pali canon into Japanese was undertaken, and it was completed in 65 volumes under the supervision of J. Takakusu and M. Nagai.

In India Pali texts were studied, edited or translated by individual scholars without any organisational support. P.V. Bapat who brought out as early as in 1924, a critical edition of the *Suttanipāta* in Devanagari characters with parallel passages from Otto Franke's work on the same subject, published in 1939 *Vimuttimagga and Visuddhimagga: A Comparative Study* and in collaboration with R.D. Bhadekar brought out critical editions in Devanagari of the *Dhammasaṅgani* (1940) and the *Aṭṭhasālinī* (1942). Dharmananda Kosambi edited the *Visuddhimagga* (1940), besides his commentaries on the *Abhidhamma* texts.[29] The Bombay University published a few Pali texts in Devanagari which were edited respectively by R.D. Vadekar and N. Bhagat. The Buddhist centre at Nalanda published the entire *Tripiṭaka* in Devanagari characters. The Mahabodhi Sabha at Sarnath had given us several Pali texts with Hindi translations.[30] On behalf of the Devanagari Pali Text Series Jagdish Kasyapa edited the principal Nikāyas (1958–60). Some Pali texts were also printed in Bengali script and were translated into Bengali.[31]

W. Geiger made immense contribution to the study of Pali language and literature by the publication of his *Pali Literatur und Sprache* in 1916. It was translated into English by B.K. Ghosh under

[29]Kosambi's pupil C.V. Rajvade edited part of the *Majjhima Nikāya* and translated the *Digha Nikāya* into Marathi. C.V. Joshi translated a number of Jātaka stories into Marathi.

[30]Rahula Sankrityayana made Hindi translation of the *Digha* and *Majjhima* Nikāyas and of the *Vinaya*. Ananda Kausalyayana made Hindi translation of 547 Jātakas in six volumes. Jagdish Kasyapa had translated into Hindi the *Milindapañho* (1932), the *Udāna* (1938) and the *Moggalāna Vyākaraṇa* (1940). The Hindi translation of *Therigāthā* (B.S. Upadhyaya), *Jātakāvalī* (B. Sharma), *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (Bhikkhu Kuttima), etc. may also be mentioned in this connection.

[31]Among the former may be mentioned the *Thera-Therigāthās, Majjhima Nikāya, Mūlapannāsaka, Mahāvagga, Buddhavaṃsa, Digha Nikāya, Pācittiya* and *Udāna* published by the Buddhist Mission, Rangoon, meant for the Bengalee Buddhists of Chittagong, while among the translations are the Jātakas (Ishan Chandra Ghosh), *Thera-Therigāthā* (Bijaya Chandra Majumdar), *Suttanipāta, Udāna, Digha* and *Majjhima* Nikāyas (Bhiksu Silabhadra of the Mahabodhi Society) etc.

the title *Pali Literature and Language* (1943). Even before the publication of Geiger's work a comprehensive history of Pali literature was presented by Maurice Winternitz in the German Original of the second volume of his *History of Indian Literature* (English version 1921). G.P. Malalasekera's *Pali Literature of Ceylon* (1928) was in a sense epoch-making because it was not only an analysis of the historical and religious literature of Ceylon, but at the same time it formed the basis of the study of doctrinal developments of Buddhism. This was followed by his celebrated *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (2 vols.,1937–38). In 1929 was published Chizen Akanuma's *Comparative Catalogue of the Chinese Āgamas and the Pali Nikāyas*. B.C. Law's *History of Pali Literature* came out in two volumes in 1933 which contained an exhaustive analysis of the contents of the Pali texts, canonical and non-canonical, with a critical emphasis on the chronological questions. The publication of the *Pali Tripiṭaka Concordance*, prepared by scholars like Woodward and others and edited by E.M. Hare, which was brought out by the PTS in 1952–55 was one of the most important contributions to the cause of Pali study and research.

III

It should be pointed out in this connection that although the existence of Pali was recognised by European scholars since 1826, in the earlier phases of Buddhist research Sanskritic sources (i.e. those translated into Chinese, Tibetan and Mongolian) played a more prominent role. In Japan the study of Buddhism, with a critical approach and a kind of modern outlook was introduced by the Japanese scholars, Tominaga Chuki and Jiun Sonja, both of whom belonged to the eighteenth century. The latter studied Sanskrit by himself in the pre-Maiji period, and having examined the fragmentary Sanskrit manuscripts of the Hariyuji and other monasteries and compared them with their Sanskrit versions, published the Sanskrit editions of a number of Sūtras and attempted to restore the Sanskrit text of the *Prajñā-naya* from its Chinese version.[32] B.H. Hodgson who stayed in Nepal as British Resident between 1821 and 1843 made a vast collection of Sanskrit Buddhist

[32]Some portions of Sonja's *Bongaku-shinryu*, collection of articles on Sanskrit study was published from Osaka in 1953 to commemorate the 150th anniversary of his death. The Sūtras, edited and published by him, were *Sukhāvātivyūha, Bhadracārinama-ārya-samantabhadra-prāṇidhāna* and *Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya*.

texts which he presented to various libraries of Calcutta, London and Paris. He also wrote papers connected with his collection.[33] Hodgson sent 88 manuscripts to Paris in 1837, and this offered Burnouf a great scope of studying Sanskrit materials directly. In 1839 Burnouf translated into French the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* which was printed in 1841, but came to light in 1852. He believed that it would be possible to find the primitive elements of Buddhism in that which was common to both Sanskrit and Pali texts.

Informations regarding the contents of the manuscripts of Buddhist Sanskrit literature were given by Rajendra Lal Mitra,[34] C. Bendall[35] and Haraprasad Sastri.[36] Unlike Pali, no complete canon has been found in Sanskrit, but fragments of a complete canon of the Sarvāstivādins, large and small, have been found from Central Asia, of which mention will be made later. Fortunately, however, most of the lost Indian Sanskrit Buddhist texts are found in their Chinese and Tibetan translation. In various academic and Buddhist institutions of Japan there are a good number of Sanskrit manuscripts; e.g. the Suzuki Research Foundation published in 1965 a catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts of the Tokyo University library compiled and edited by S. Matsunami. The discovery and publication of the Gilgit manuscripts by N. Dutt (1939–56) also brought a new dimension in the field of study in the Sanskrit sources of Buddhism. In Sanskrit, pure or mixed, there are several independent works belonging to different schools of both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. Among these, the *Mahāvastu* is a compendium of different subjects belonging to the *Lokottaravādin* sect. It was originally edited by E. Senart between 1882 and 1897 in three volumes with a valuable survey of its contents and important comments.[37] The English translation of the *Lalitavistara* was published by R.L. Mitra between 1853 and 1877 from the MS.

[33] *Asiatic Researches*, XVI, 1828; *Trans. Royal Asiatic Soc.*, London, II, 1829, *His Memoirs* (1837) was reprinted in 1874: *Essays on the Languages, Literature and Religion of Nepal and Tibet*. His *Miscellaneous Essays on Indian Subjects* was reprinted in 1880.

[34] *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, Calcutta, 1882.

[35] *Catalogue of Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in Cambridge*, Cambridge, 1883.

[36] *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts of the ASB, I. Buddhist Manuscripts*, Calcutta, 1917.

[37] A survey of its contents was also given by R.L. Mitra (*Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, Calcutta, 1882, 115–61) and by Valleé Poussin (*ERE*, VIII. 328 ff.); Eng. trans. J.J. Jones (1949–56). See R.G. Basak, *A Study on the Mahāvastu Avadana*, Calcutta, 1961; T. Rahula, *A Critical Study of the Mahāvastu*, Delhi, 1978.

belonging to the Hodgson collection.[38] In 1892, S. Lévi published the first chapter of the *Buddhacarita* which was subsequently edited and translated into English by E.B. Cowell.[39] The *Saundarānanda* was discovered and edited by Haraprasad Sastri.[40] In the branch of the Avadāna literature, the *Divyāvadāna* was edited by E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil in 1886 and its French translation by L. Feer came out in 1891. The *Avadānaśataka* was edited by J.S. Speyer in 2 vols. in 1906–09.[41] The *Jātakamālā* of Āryaśūra was edited by H. Kern in 1891.[42]

Among the Mahāyāna texts, Burnouf's edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* was published as early as in 1852. An English translation of this text was published by H. Kern in 1884.[43] The *Laṅkāvatārasūtra* was edited by B. Nanjio in 1923 (Eng. trans. D.T. Suzuki, London, 1932). The *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* was edited by S.C. Das in 1898.[44] In Central Asia its fragments have been discovered. The Sanskrit edition of the *Daśabhūmaka* (*Daśabhūmika* or *Daśabhūmeśvara* was published by J. Rahder in 1926 from Louvain.[45] The prose and metrical versions of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* were edited respectively by S.B. Samasrami (1873) and S.C. Sastri (1898). Among the texts belonging to the Prajñāpāramitā group, the

[38] *Bib. Ind.*, rep., 1881–86. Foucaux's French trans. (1847) was reprinted in 1884 and 1892. S. Lefmann's edition in two volumes (1902, 1908) was subsequently reprinted by P.L. Vaidya, in BST, Darbhanga, 1958.

[39] *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series*, I, pt. VII, 1893; Eng. tr. in *SBE*, LIX, 1893; German tr. of the French version by Hans Ludwig, 1912; also by C. Cappeller 1922, R. Schmidt, 1924, and F. Weller, Tibetan text with German tr. 1926, 1928; Italian tr. by C. Formichi, 1912; Eng. tr. by E.H. Johnston, 1935; Central Asian fragments ed. by Weller, 1953.

[40] Critical ed. by E.H. Johnston, 1928; Eng. tr by the same 1932.

[41] Published in Nagari characters by P.L. Vaidya in *BST*, 1958.

[42] HOS, I., Eng. tr. by J. Speyer in *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, I, 1895.

[43] *SBE*, XXI. Sanskrit ed. by Kern and Nanjio, 1908–12; by Wogihara 1934; with German notes by W. Baruah 1938; by N. Dutt 1952; tr. of the Central Asian version by F. Weller, 1965.

[44] Sanskrit ed. Nanjio 1931, Noble, 1937. Tibetan, Uigur and Chinese ed. Noble 1958; tr. by the same from Tibetan (1944) and from Chinese (1958).

[45] The Sanskrit and Tibetan version which French tr. (chs. I- VI) was previously published by Valleé Poussin (1907–11) which was re-edited with Eng. tr. of ch. VII by J. Rahder (1926) who also made its glossary (1928–29) after the Sanskrit, Tibetan, Mongolian and Chinese versions. Another ed. was published by Kondo in 1936.

Vajracchedikā, also known as *Prajñāp* 300, was edited and translated by Max Müller.[46] The *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* was edited by R.L. Mitra in 1888.[47] An unfinished edition of the Sanskrit *Prajñāp* 100,000 made by R. Ghosh was published in 1902–14. The Sanskrit fragments of *Prajñāp* 150, mixed with Khotanese translation, were edited by Leumann (1912). Selected texts of this class was published by Max Walleser (1914) and G. Tucci (1923). The *Abhisamayālaṅkāra-kārikā*, also known as *Prajñāpāramitopadeśa-śāstra* of Maitreyanātha was edited in 1929 along with its Tibetan version and an English translation and explanatory notes by Th. Stcherbatsky and E. Obermiller.[48] The Sanskrit version of *Prajñāp* 25000 was partly edited by N. Dutt in 1934. The Sanskrit edition of *Prajñāp* 2500, also known as *Suvikrāntavikramiparipṛcchā*, was published by Hikata in 1958.[49]

The *Kāśyapaparivarta*, which is often identified with the *Ratnakūṭa*, was edited in the light of the Tibetan and Chinese versions in 1926 by A. von Stael-Holstein who also published valuable fragments of the Sanskrit original of this work which were found in the neighbourhood of Khotan. The Sanskrit version of the *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, edited by L. Finot, was published in 1901.[50] As early as in 1883 the Sanskrit version of the *Sukhāvati-vyūha* was edited and published by Max Müller.[51] The Sanskrit edition of *Ratnaguṇasaṃcayagāthā* made by Obermiller was published in 1937 in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series.[52] The Sanskrit text of the *Mādhyamika-Kārikās* of Nāgārjuna was edited with Candrakīrti's *Prasannapadā*

[46]Oxford 1881, Eng. tr. in SBE, XLIX, 1884.

[47]Subsequently ed. by Wogihara (1932–35) along with Haribhadra's com. *Abhisamayālaṅkāraloka*, the Sanskrit version of which was edited by Tucci (1932). Eng. trans. H.P. Sastri.

[48]Cf. H.P. Sastri in *JASB*, 1910, 425 ff.; portions tr. in French by P.M. Oursel in *Journal Asiatique*, 1913, 598 ff.

[49]Special studies on the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature were undertaken by E. Conze which included the *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (tr. with Sanskrit Tibetan Index 1954), *Vajracchedikā* (1957), *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (1968), the Gilgit MSS. of *Aṣṭasāhasrikā* (1962), *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (1966), *Materials for a Dictionary of the Prajñāpāramitā Literature* (1967), etc.

[50]Subsequently published in *Indo-Iranian Reprints*, The Hague, 1957; by P.L. Vaidya in *BST*, I, 1961.

[51]Reprinted in *BST*, 1961; subsequently edited by The Hague, Tokyo, 1931

commentary by Valleé Poussin (1903–13).[53] Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (first published in 1894) was also edited by Valleé Poussin[54] while his *Śikṣāsamuccaya* was edited by C. Bendall (1897, 1902) and translated into English by Bendall and W.H.D. Rouse (1922). The Sanskrit fragments of Āryadeva's *Catuḥśataka* were discovered and edited by H.P. Sastri.[55] The *Madhyāntavibhaṅgaśāstra* of Maitreya-Asaṅga with its commentaries, the *bhāṣya* of Vasubandhu and the *ṭīkā* of Sthiramati, belong to the most fundamental works of Vijñānavāda. The MS. of its Sanskrit original had the fate of being discovered twice. The story of this double discovery and of the double text-edition had been narrated by the discoverer Sylvain Lévi in the preface to the second edition of the text. In 1932, a version of the text with the sub-commentary of Sthiramati, edited by Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya and Giuseppe Tucci, was published.[56] Th. Stcherbatsky's English rendering of the *Madhyāntavibhaṅga*, which came out in 1934, contained besides the Kārikās of Maitreya-Asaṅga, a translation of Vasubandhu's *bhāṣya* as well as the *ṭīkā* of Sthiramati. The latter was separately translated again by Friedman in 1937.[57]

The French translation of the *Abhidharmakośa* was published in six volumes along with Yaśomitra's commentary on it known as *Sphutārtha-Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* by Valleé Poussin who had also made use of the Tibetan version of Vasubandhu's own commentary and the Chinese versions of *Paramārtha* and Hiuen Tsang. Sanskrit edition along with the Tibetan version of Yaśomitra's *Sphutārthavyākhyā* was published by Wogihara between 1932 and 1936. Some Sanskrit fragments of Diṅnāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya* were collected and published by Randle in 1926.[58] Śaṅkarasvāmin's *Nyāyapraveśa*, which is wrongly attributed to Diṅnāga, was edited

[52]Subsequently published in *Indo-Iranian Reprints*, The Hague, 1961; rep. by P.L. Vaidya with the help of an additional MS. in *BST*, 1961.

[53]Tr. Stcherbatsky, et al., 1927–59.

[54]1901–14; rep. Vaidya, *BST*, 1960; French tr. Valleé Poussin (1907) and L. Finot (1920); Italian, G. Tucci. Bengali tr. by Sujit Kumar Mukhopadhyaya (1947).

[55]*Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, III, 449–514.

[56]Calcutta Oriental Series, no.20.

[57]A reprint of Stcherbatsky's tr. was published from Calcutta in 1971. The Suzuki Research Foundation had published the *Madhyānta-vibhāga-bhāṣya* in 1964 edited by G.M. Nagao. The text was prepared from a Tibetan Sanskrit manuscript and had the

after its Tibetan and Sanskrit version by Dhruva in two volumes (GOS, 1927–30). The Sanskrit version of Dharmakīrti's *Vādanyāya* was edited by Rahula Sankrityayana in 1935–36 together with Śāntarakṣita's commentary on it known as *Vipañcitārtha*.[59] Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṃgraha* along with Kamalasīla's *Pañjikā* or commentary on it was edited by E. Krishnamacharya (2 vols., GOS, 1926) and translated by Ganganath Jha.[60] Sanskrit edition of Jitari's *Jātinirākaraṇa* was published by Tucci in 1930.[61] The original Sanskrit version of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* was discovered by Rahula Sankrityayana during his expedition in Tibet (1934–36). Manorathanandī's *vṛtti* on the *Kārikās* of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* was edited by him in 1938–40.[62] Sanskrit edition of Karṇakagomin's *ṭīkā* on Dharmakīrti's *vṛtti* to the first chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika* was published from Allahabad by Rahula[63] while that of the *Vādasthāna* was published from Mysore by H.R.R. Aiyangar in 1944. Mokṣakāragupta's *Tarkabhāṣā*, edited by Krishnamacharya came out from Baroda (GOS) in 1942. From Jayaswal Institute A. Thakur published *Ratnakīrtinibandhāvalī* (1957) and *Jñānaśrīmitra-nibandhāvalī* (1959) as the collected writings of Ratnakīrti and Jñānaśrīmitra. In 1959, Frauwallner published Tibetan and Sanskrit editions of a number of fragmentary works of Diṅnāga.

There are also a good number of Sanskrit texts on Tantric Buddhism. Many of the *Dhāraṇī* texts which presuppose Tantric Buddhism are recorded in R.L. Mitra's *Nepalese Buddhist Literature* and Bendall's *Catalogue*. The *Pañcakrama* which is an extract of the *Guhyasamāja* was edited by Valleé Poussin in 1896 who also edited the *Ādikarmapradīpa* in 1898 with introduction and analysis of contents. These works contain precepts on the initiation ceremonies, on the rules of rituals, on the readings of the *Prajñāpāramitā*, on meditations and so on. To this class belongs the *Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā* of Kuladatta, etc.[64] The *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* referred to

[59]Appendices to *JBORS*, XXI–XXII.

[60]2 vols. GOS, 1937–38.

[61]*ABORI*, XI.

[62]Appendices to *JBORS*, XXI–XXII.

[63]Dharmakīrti's *Prmāṇavārttika* and its *vṛtti* was edited by Rahul in 1953, by Malavaniya in 1959 and by Gnoli in 1960.

[64]R.L.Mitra, op.cit., 105 ff.; H.P. Sastri, *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sans. MSS. in ASB*, I, 119 ff.

above may also be regarded as the precursor of Tantric Buddhism. Most Tantric Buddhist texts are in Tibetan, though a few of them are found in Sanskrit original. Considerable extracts from a Sanskrit MS of the *Caṇḍamahāroṣana-tantra* were given by H.P. Sastri in 1917.[65] The *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* was edited by T. Ganapati Sastri in 1920–22.[66] The complete text of the *Sādhanamālā* was edited by B.T. Bhattacharyya which was published from Baroda in two volumes (1925,1928).[67] H.P. Sastri's *Advayavajrasaṃgraha* (Collection of works supposed to be written by the celebrated Tantric teacher Advayavajra) was published in 1927. Indrabhūti's *Jñānasiddhi* and Anaṅgavajra's *Prajñopāyaviniścayasiddhi* were edited by B.T. Bhattacharyya in 1929[68] who also edited and published in 1931 the oldest extant Buddhist Tantra, the *Tathāgata-guhyaka* or *Guhyasamāja*. Of other important textual publications reference should be made to *Bhaiṣajyaguru, Ekādaśamukha, Hayagrīvavidyā* and *Sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhānavyūha*, all edited in Sanskrit in.the *Gilgit MSS*, I, (1939). The *Ratnaketudhāraṇī* was edited in volume IV in the *Gilgit MSS* (1959). These texts have also their Tibetan versions. A text of the *Dākārṇava* is found in Apabhraṃśa. It has also a Tibetan version. It was edited by N.N. Chaudhuri in 1935.[69] There

[65]H.P. Sastri, op.cit., I, 131 ff.

[66]Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, nos. LXX and LXXVI; cf. J. Przyluski in *Bulletin de l'ecole francaise d'Extreme Orient*, XXIII, 1923, 301 ff.

[67]GOS, XXVI, XLI; cf. V. Bhattacharyya and K.S. Ramaswami Sastri in *Indian Historical Quarterly*, II, 1926, 626 ff.; III, 1927, 161 ff.

[68]GOS, XLIV.

[69]In 1907 Haraprasad Sastri collected as many as fifty mystic ritual songs of the Tantric Buddhists from Nepal and these were published in 1916 under the title *Bauddha Gān O Dohā*. These were known as Caryā songs belonging to the Dohās category and regarded as the oldest form of Bengali and other eastern languages. Subsequently P.C. Bagchi discovered from the Tanjur collection the Tibetan translation of all these songs (1938) and published more Dohās composed by Sarahapāda, Kānhapāda and Tillopāda. See *Dohākoṣa*, Calcutta Sanskrit Series, 1938; *Journal of the Dept. of Letters*, XXVIII, 1–180, XXX, 1–156. The songs of Kānha and Saraha were translated with learned interpretations and comments in French by M. Shahidullah in his *Les Chants Mystiques de Kanha et de Saraha*, Paris, 1928. Rahul Sankrityayana had discovered and published many more Dohās of Sarahapāda and also published the Tibetan translation of a good number of Dohās of Saraha, the originals of which are still missing. *Dohākoṣa* with Hindi tr., Patna,1957. In 1956 appeared the *Caryāgītikoṣa of Buddhist Siddhas*, edited and annotated by P.C. Bagchi in collaboration with Santi Bhiksu Sastri. The work is an edition of the text of the obscure Bengali Caryā songs and the Sanskrit commentary thereon by Munidatta discovered by H.P. Sastri from

is a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Kālacakratantra* in Cambridge (Add. no. 1364). It has also a Tibetan version which was worked out by A.I. Vostrikov who made a Russian rendering of the text in the thirties. Its commentary made by Nāḍapāda is known as *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* which was edited by M.E. Carelli in 1941 (GOS). There is another commentarial work on the *Kālacakratantra* known as *Vimalaprabhā* (Asiatic Society MS. no. 4727) which was edited by Biswanath Banerjee. Abhayākaragupta's *Niṣpaṇṇayogāvalī*, which belongs to the class of *Sādhanamālā* and deals with the characteristics of the deities of Vajrayāna was edited by B.T. Bhattacharyya (1949, GOS). Snellgrove's edition and translation of the *Hevajratantra* came out in 1959 in two volumes.

IV

Although we have mentioned the editions and translations of some Sanskrit sources relevant for the study of Buddhism, it is a fact that no complete Sanskrit canonical literature was found in India, excepting a few fragments and fewer texts. The works which we have mentioned were mostly collected from Central Asia, Tibet and China. Fortunately, however, the translations of a vast number of Sanskrit Buddhist texts are found in the Tibetan and the Chinese. Although some scholars tried to reconstruct the Sanskrit original on the basis of the Tibetan and Chinese versions, such attempts, however, could not make up the deficit accrued in space and time.

The story of the study of the Tibetan sources is very interesting. In the thirteenth century Pope Innocent IV sent the Franciscan and Dominican friars as envoys to Mongol Khan. Informations on Buddhism were given by the Franciscan friar Wilhelm van Ruyksbroeck who spent six months in 1254 in Karakorum. In his *Itinerarium* he gave an accurate description of Lamaism and Lamaistic formulas. Marco Polo closely knew the Tibetan Buddhists and his account contained reflections of their religious life. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries informations on Tibetan Buddhism were sent to Europe by the Christian missionaries. Coming to more modern times we find that Francesco Orazio della Penna, a Capuchin missionary who lived in Lhasa from 1716 to 1732, compiled a Tibetan Dictionary which was later translated

Nepal and published in 1916. Both the text and the commentary have been edited in the light of Tibetan translations previously discovered by Bagchi.

into English by F.C.G. Schroeder.[70] Penna also translated Tsonkha-pa's *Lam-rim-chin-mo* and the *Prātimokṣa*, but these are now lost. His account of Tibetan history was published by Antoneo Georgi in his *Alphabetum Tibetanum Apostolicarum Commodo Editum* (1762). Another Jesuit missionary Ippolito Desideri, who stayed in Lasha from 1717 to 1721 acquired direct knowledge of Tibetan language, literature and religion and wrote a book in 1729 on Tibetan custom and religion.[71]

The British East India Company with its head quarters in Calcutta came into contact with Tibet through the efforts of one Bengalee adventurer Puran Giri (1743–95) who was at the same time a monk, a scholar, a businessman and a diplomat. He travelled extensively in Afghanistan, Iran and Central Asia, went to Moscow, and eventually made Tibet his favourite resort, in which country he visited several times. He had a great hold on Tasi Lama, who was then acting as the guardian of the minor Dalai Lama, and was also acquainted with the Chinese emperor. Warren Hastings had a great faith on him and through him maintained East India Company's diplomatic relations with Tibet and China. Lord Cornwallis and Sir John Shore, the successors of Hastings, also received his help in Chinese and Tibetan matters. He wrote a book on his sojourn in Tibet which was translated into English in 1808. With the financial assistance of Panchen Lama and East India Company he made a big monastic establishment at Ghusuri near Calcutta which was known as Bhotbagan Math. It became a commercial centre of the Tibetans where they used to come and stay and also a centre of Tibetan studies. Like Lawrence of Arabia, this talented adventurer met a tragic end in 1795 when he was killed in an encounter with an organised gang of bandits who robbed his monastery of all its treasures and destroyed it.

It was, however, Alexander Csoma de Koros who was responsible for a renovated study of the Tibetan sources of Buddhism. He came to India from Hungary in 1823, studied Tibetan at Ladakh, compiled a grammar and dictionary of the Tibetan language and wrote papers on Tibetology introducing the Tanjur and Kanjur

[70] *A Dictionary of Bhotanta or Boutan Language*, Serampore, 1826.

[71] The MS was discovered by C. Puini in 1875 who published its extracts in 1904; in complete English version by F. de Filippi in 1931; Complete and annotated ed. of the original by Luciano Petech in his vols. (1953 ff.) on document relating to the Christian missions in Tibet and Nepal.

collections. Over 4,500 works of the Indian Buddhists, the Indian originals of which are largely lost, survive in meticulous Tibetan translation. These are contained in the great Tibetan collections called the Kanjur and the Tanjur, broadly meaning the collections of the words of the Buddha and of the expositary treatises by the Ācāryas. As early as in 1827 E. Burnouf had referred to the Tanjur and Kanjur in a note on Tibetan literature the extract of which was published in a Calcutta journal. In 1845, I.J. Schmidt brought out an index of the Kanjur collection under the title *Der Index des Kanjur*. It is interesting to note that the Tibetans themselves prepared numerous descriptive catalogues of these collections.[72] The Peking edition of the Tanjur (1724) is of the nature of a real descriptive catalogue in the modern sense.[73] It was the main source of P. Cordier's monumental work *Catalogue du fonds tibetain de la Bibliotheque Nationale, II eme-III eme parties: Index du bsTan'gyur* (Paris, 1909–15). Cordier intended to make the Kanjur the first part of his *Catalogue*. But he took up the Tanjur first for the second and third parts of his work. He also intended to make a fourth part containing the index. But he was prevented from completing his project because of his premature death in the first world war. His unfulfilled project of preparing an index to the *Catalogue* was taken up by M. Lalou whose *Repertoire du Tanjur d'apres le Catalogue de P. Cordier* came out as a Bibliotheque Nationale publication in 1933 from Paris.[74]

The so called 'histories of religion or the doctrine' (*Chos-'byun*) are very important sources for the study of Indian Buddhism. As

[72]It should be noted in this connection that Benjamin Bergman translated several Kalmyk texts and published a big work in 1804-5 which became an important source for the study of religion and rituals as practised by the Kalmyks living between the Volga and the Don and of Lamaism in general. I.J. Schmidt (1779-1847) made a thorough study of the Mongolian and Tibetan sources and, besides his *Life of Buddha* (1825), he published several articles between 1832 and 1837 on Tibetan sources of Mahāyāna Buddhism. Studies on the Simhalese, Burmese and Siamese sources were initiated respectively by R. Spence Hardy (1850). P. Bigandet (1858) and H. Alabaster (1872).

[73]Photo-reproduction under the title *Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1957–58. Among other editions mention should be made to SDe-dge (1729), sNar-than (1730)—both relating to the Kanjur—and Co-ne (1773) dealing with Tanjur.

[74]In 1972 Alaka Chattopadhyaya published in English the first volume of her *Catalogue of Indian (Buddhist) Texts in Tibetan Translations: Kanjur and Tanjur* in which attempt has been made to rearrange the essential information contained in P. Cordier's *Catalogue* and to improve M. Lalou's *Index*.

early as in 1838 the *Chos-'byun* of Bu-ston Rin-chengrub (1290–1364) was described by Alexander Csoma de Koros as a mine of information. This work was used by V.P. Vasilev (Wassiljew) who was the first to make a critical evaluation of it.[75] Passages from this work were translated by Th. Stcherbatsky,[76] Sarat Chandra Das,[77] L.A. Waddell,[78] C. Bell[79] and others. In 1931–32 a complete translation of Bu-ston's *History* made by E. Obermiller, was published. The *Deb-ther-snon-po* or the *Blue Annals*, composed by Gos-lo-tsa-ba (1392–1481) was used as early as in 1836 by J. Prinsep who published a genealogical list of the Tibetan kings.[80] V.P. Vasilev recorded the importance of this work,[81] while Sarat Chandra Das utilised the *Blue Annals* in his 'Contributions on the Religion, History, etc. of Tibet'.[82] It was used by Charles Bell who also gave in his book its brief table of contents,[83] while G. Tucci published several passages from it.[84] Complete English translation of the *Blue Annals* was made by G. Roerich in two volumes (1949–53) which was published from Calcutta. A translation of the *Deb-ther-dmar-po* or the *Red Annals* was brought out by G. Tucci in 1959. The Tibetan text of the first and second parts of the *Pag-Sam Jon-Zang*, written by Sumpa-mkhan-po, was published in 1908 by Sarat Chandra Das with translation of some selected passages. The third part was subsequently edited by Lokesh Chandra which came out in 1959. Lama Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism in India* (1608) was first translated into Russian by V.P. Vasilev in 1868 and an edition of it was brought out by A. Schiefner in the same year. Schiefner's German translation, based upon Vasilev's Russian, was published in 1869. Schiefner's German and Vasilev's Russian apart, the only

[75]*Buddizm*, pt. III, 5 ff., 42–44, 58 ff.

[76]'Notes de litteratur bouddhique', in *Le Museon*, VI, 1905, 144–55.

[77]*JBTS*, 1893. Das has included a translation of Bu-ston's account of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla

[78]*JRAS*, 1909, 923 ff.; *The Buddhism of Tibet*, London, 1885, 166 ff.

[79]*The Religion of Tibet*, Oxford, 1931, 200 ff.

[80]'Useful Tables' in *JRAS*, 1836, 131–32.

[81]On some books relating to the History of Buddhism in the Library of the University of Kazan, 1855.

[82]*JASB*, 1881, 82 ff.

[83]Bell, op.cit., 200 ff.

[84]*Indo-Tibetica*, II. Rin chen bzan po ela rinascita del buddhismo intorno al mille, Rome, 1933, 77–84.

complete translation of Tāranātha's *History* exists in Japanese which was done by Enga Teramoto (1928). The great Indian linguist Harinath De started translating Tāranātha's *History*, and a few pages of his translation appeared in a journal called *The Herald* (1911). N. Dutt and U.N. Ghoshal translated portions of Tāranātha's *History* in the pages of *Indian Historical Quarterly*, but these were done from Schiefner's German rendering. In 1970 came out a fresh English translation made by Alaka Chattopadhyaya and Lama Chimpa. It followed mainly the Potala edition of 1946, but was thoroughly checked from the first letter-press edition of St. Petersburg which was originally published by Schiefner in 1868.

Studies on the Tibetan sources of Buddhism received a fresh fillip through the efforts of another Bengalee scholar adventurist Sarat Chandra Das who went to Lhasa in 1879 and 1881. He had collected a great deal of materials from the ancient libraries of the Sakya and Sam-ye monasteries of Lhasa. The thrilling accounts of his journey were published in the *Journal of the Buddhist Text Society*. Most of his works were however on the geography, history and ethnology of Tibet. But some like Sumpa's *Pag-Sam-Jon-Zang* (which he edited), 'Contributions on the Religion, History, etc. of Tibet,[85] *Indian Pandits in the Land of Snow* (1893), *Avadānakalpalatā* (ed. 1888), *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (ed. 1898), *Tibetan-English Dictionary* (1900) etc. were very useful for the study of Buddhism—apart from the vast mass of manuscripts he brought to India subsequently worked out by other scholars. A.I. Vastrikov made the following comment on him: "Though the works of Sarat Chandra Das suffer from many errors and inaccuracies, we cannot and must not forget that it is precisely to him that the world of Tibetology is indebted for its first familiarity with the contents of a number of important historical texts which heretofore were totally unknown or were only known by title. And in this lies his great and indisputable service to scholarship. Even till today, many texts used by S.C. Das (often without naming them) remain unpublished, untranslated and uninvestigated."[86] After Sarat Chandra Das, Rahul Sankrityayana and Giuseppe Tucci undertook several expeditions to Tibet and brought many valuable materials of Tibetan Buddhist literature and art.

[85] *JASB*, I (1881), 127–251; II (1882), 1–75, 87–128.

[86] *Tibetan Historical Literature*, Calcutta, 1970.

While dealing with the Sanskrit texts we have already had the occasion to refer to their Tibetan versions.[87] There also exist a large number of translations from Indian texts into the Chinese. In his *Catalogue* B. Nanjio records as many as 1662 texts. The *Hobogirin*, an encyclopaedic dictionary, mentions as many as 2148 texts printed in 55 volumes of the Taisho edition. In another 25 volumes exist supplementary texts written in China and Japan. In Japan there are three complete translations of the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*, besides the said 25 volumes of the Taisho edition. In the Manchurian language there is also a translation of the same, and in Mongolian, a translation of the Tibetan Tanjur.

In the modern sense, study of the Chinese sources was inaugurated with the publication of C.J. Neumann's work on the Chinese Buddhist pilgrims who came to India (1833). This was followed in 1836 by A. Remusat's translation of Fahien's account.[88] In 1848 was published the French translation of the Mongol version of Kaśyapa Matańga's Sūtra by Gabet and Huc. Complete works of Hiuen Tsang were translated into French in two volumes (1853, 1857–59) by St. Julien[89] who also made a translation of the Chinese version of a lost Sanskrit collection of the *Avadānas*. Texts from the

[87] Among other Tibetan texts edited and translated the following deserve special mention: *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins (Rockhill, 1884, tr. extracts); *Suhṛllekha* (tr. Wenzeh, 1886); *Dharmapada* (tr. Rockhill, 1892, ed. Beckh, 1911); *Mādhyamakāvatāra* and *Abhidharmakośa* (ed. and tr. Vallée Poussin, 1907–12, 1923-31); *Mūlamādhyamakavṛtti* (ed. Walleser, 1913–14); *Santānāntarasiddhi* (ed. and tr. Stcherbatsky, 1916, 1922); *Cakrasaṃvara* (ed. Dawa Samdup, 1919); *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* (ed. Stcherbatsky and Obermiller, 1929, tr. Conze, 1954); *Ratnagotravibhāga* (tr. Obermiller, 1932); *Ālambanaparīkṣā*, *Apohaprakaraṇa* and *Hetucakraḍamaru* (ed. and tr. Frauwallner, 1930, 1936, 1959); *Sandhinirmocana* and *Mahāyānasaṃgraha* (ed. and tr. Lamotte, 1935, 1938-39); *Kāśyaparivartaṭīkā* (ed. Stael-Holstein, 1933); *Mahāvairocana* (tr. Tajima, 1936); *Nikāyabheda etc.* of Bhāvaviveka and *Samayabheda etc.* of Vinītadeva (tr. Bareau, 1956); *Vaidulyasūtra* (ed. Kajiyama, 1965); etc. Among the reconstructed Sanskrit texts from the Tibetan mention may be made of the *Hastavālaprakaraṇe* (F.W. Thomas and H.Ui, 1981), *Hetucakraḍamaru* (D. Chatterjee,1933), *Prajñā—10,000* (S.Konow, 1941), *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (P. Pradhan, 1952), *Nayāyavindu* (M.K. Gangopadhyaya, 1971), etc.

[88] J.H Legge's account of Fa-hien's travel came out from Oxford in 1892 while that of H.A. Giles from Cambridge in 1923.

[89] S. Beal's tr. of the *Si-yu-ki* and *Life of Hiuen Tsang* (by Shaman Hwui Li) came out respectively in 1885 and 1888 and these were followed by T. Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, 1904–5; cf. T.M. Chau, *Hiuen Tsang: The Pilgrim and the Scholar*, Nhatrang, 1963.

Chinese Buddhist canon were translated by S. Beal in a series of works done during the period between 1871 and 1878.[90] On the travels of I-tsing we have the translations made by E. Chavannes (1894) and J. Takakusu (1896). Subsequently in the field of Chinese sources the researches of Paul Pelliot and Paul Demieville have increased much of our knowledge.[91]

In 1883 after the publication of B. Nanjio's *Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka* studies in Chinese sources received a fresh momentum. In 1885, K. Kasahara published *Dharmasaṃgraha*, a collection of Buddhist technical terms. In 1900 Takakusu published *A Pali Chrestomathy with Chinese Equivalents* which was followed by M. Anesaki's *Concordance of the Pali Texts with their Chinese Version* (1908) and C. Anakuma's *Comparative Catalogue of the Chinese Āgamas and Pali Nikāyas* (1920). In 1926 S. Lévi came to Japan and laid the foundation of a Centre of Buddhist research which came to be known as Maison Franco Japonaise. Here he sponsored the project of compiling an encyclopaedic dictionary, the *Hobogirin*. His collaborators were Takakusu, Anesaki, Inoue, Suziyama and others. Its first three fascicules were published in 1929–31. A *Dictionary of the Chinese Buddhist Terms* was prepared by W.E. Soothill and L. Hodous (1937). *Table der Taisho-Issaiko*, attached to the *Hobogirin* was edited by Demieville based upon which were published two kinds of Japanese translations—*Kokuyaku Issaiko* in 150 vols. and *Kokuyaku Daizokyo* in 28 vols., 1928–35. The bibliographical study on the Chinese version of the *Tripiṭaka* was crystallized in G. Ono's *Bussho Kaisetsu Daijesten* or the *Dictionary of Buddhist Bibliography* (12 vols., 1933–35). Among the Indian writers P.C. Bagchi had given us a lexicon of Sanskrit-Chinese terms (*Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois*, 1929, 1937). His *Canon Bouddhique in Chine* (1937–38) is a very valuable work containing highly useful information regarding Chinese translations of early Indian texts.

[90] *A. Catena of Buddhist Scriptures*, London, 1872; *Buddhist Tripiṭaka as it is Known in China and Japan*, London,1876; *Abhiṇiṣkramaṇa-sūtra*, tr. from Chinese, *JRAS*, 1873, 227 ff.; *Scriptural Texts from the Buddhist Canon*, London, 1878. As early as in 1869 he published the accounts of the travels of Fa-hien and Sun Yung in his *Travels of Buddhist Pilgrims*.

[91] Pelliot's contribution to Buddhist studies up to 1928 has been given in the *Bibliographie bouddhique*, IV–V, Paris, 1934, 3–19. His important publications since 1928 have been recorded by Demieville in *Paul Pelliot*, Paris, 1946, 25–54. The *Choix d' etudes Bouddhiques*, Leiden,1973 deals with the contributions of Demieville to Buddhist studies.

From different sites of Central Asia numerous Buddhist manuscripts in Prakrit, Sanskrit, Uigur, Tokharian, Khotanese, Kuchean, Sogdian and also in other dialects have been found. As early as in 1890, Colonel Bower purchased from the local Turks an extensive birch-bark manuscript which was dug out from the sands of Qumtura, a site near Kucha. It was a medical treatise written in Sanskrit in the north Indian script of the fourth century A.D. It was subsequently edited by Hoernle in three volumes. A few years later, a French traveller Detrenil de Rhins came across two birch-bark manuscripts from Khotan. These were found to be a new Prakrit version of the *Dhammapada* written in the Kharosthi script of the second century A.D.[92] This evoked much interest among scholars and archaeologists and led to the organisation of several expeditions conducted by Sir Aurel Stein (three expeditions between 1900 and 1916), four German expeditions led by Albert Grünwedel and Georg Huth (1902–03), Von Le Cog (1904–05), Le Cog and Grunwedel (1905–07) and Le Cog (1913–14), one French expedition led by Paul Pelliot (1906–08), three Japanese expeditions (1902–04, 1908–09, 1910–13) and three Russian expeditions, the first led by D. Klementz (1898), the second and third by Serge Oldenburg (1909–10, 1914–15).[93] In the last thirty years great progress has been made in Central Asian studies, owing mostly to the Russian endeavour.

Among the finds of manuscripts in Central Asia the fragments of the Āgamas (corresponding to Pali Nikāyas) were probably the oldest. These were edited in the first volume of Hoernle's *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature in Eastern Turkestan* (1916). Stein and Hoernle discovered a portion of the *Suttanipāta*. Stein, Grünwedel and Pelliot discovered fragments of a manuscript of a Sanskrit text called *Udānavarga* similar in contents to *Dharmapada*.

[92] On the basis of information of these fragments B.M. Barua and S.N. Mitra published revised edition of the *Dharmapada* in 1921.

[93] Other expeditions are mentioned by Jack A. Dabbs, *History of the Discovery and Explorations of Chinese Turkestan*, The Hague, 1963. A Bibliography of Central Asian Studies has been published in the first volume of the *Monumenta Serindica*, Kyoto, 1958, 53–87. All Sanskrit fragments published by the German scholars from 1904 to 1964 are listed in Waldschmidt's *Sanskrit handschriften aus des Turfanfunden*, Wiesbaden, 1965, XXVI–XXXII (for the years from 1964 to 1970, see ibid., 275–76) Sanskrit fragments of the Pelliot collection have been listed by Bernard Pauly in *Journal Asiatique* (1965), 83–121, 183–87, (1966) 245–304, (1961) 231–41. Yamada's *Bongo butter no sobunken*, Kyoto,1959 contains lists of Sanskrit fragments belonging to the London, Leningrad and Japan collections.

This text had a Tibetan version which was edited as early as in 1883 by Rockhill.[94] A complete text of the *Prātimokṣa Sūtra* discovered by the French mission in the ruins of Duldur Aqur at Kucha was edited by L. Finot in 1913. The *Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa* was also discovered by both French and German missions which was edited by Waldschmidt in 1926. An incomplete manuscript of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavacana* belonging to the Sanskrit Vinaya was found which was edited by Valleé Poussin and Ridding.[95] Sanskrit version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* was discovered by the German mission from the ruins of Soreuq near Turfan. A detailed study of this Sūtra was made by Waldschmidt, and it was subsequently edited by him in 1950.[96] In the Berlin collection there is a manuscript of the *Nidānasaṃyukta* which was first edited and published by Waldschmidt in 1932 and then by Tripathi in 1962. Among other Sanskrit manuscripts, the *Vinayavastu-Karmavācana* was edited by Hartel (1952, 1956), *Vinayavibhaṅga* by Rosen (1959), *Mahāvadāna* by Waldschmidt (1952, 1956), *Catuṣpariṣat* by Waldschmidt (1952, 1957, 1962) and *Daśottara* by Mittal and Schlingloff (1957, 1962).

A manuscript of *Vajracchedikā-Prajñāpāramitā*[97] was discovered by Stein in 1900–1901. He also discovered a fragment of *Nīlakaṇṭha-dhāraṇī* which was edited by Valleé Poussin and R. Gauthot in 1912.[98] In Hoernle's collection fragments of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa, Ratnadhvajasūtra, Bhadrapālasūtra, Ratnarasisūtra, Anantanukha-dhāraṇī* and *Mahāpratyaṅgirādhāraṇī* were published with translations. Fragments of Aśvaghoṣa's works were discovered by the German mission from the Turfan region which were studied mostly by Lüders and Lévi in the light of Chinese sources. Fragments of Mātṛceṭa's works containing both Sanskrit original and Tokharian translation, found from various sites such as Jigdalik-Bai, Tunhuang, Khora etc. were studied by Stein, Hoernle, Valleé Poussin, Lévi and others. Fragments of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*

[92]On the basis of information of these fragments B.M. Barua and S.N. Mitra published revised edition of the *Dharmapada* in 1921.

[93]Other expeditions are mentioned by Jack A. Dabbs, *History of the Discovery and Explorations of Chinese Turkestan*, The Hague, 1963. A Bibliography of Central Asian Studies has been published in the first volume of the *Monumenta Serindica*, Kyoto, 1958, 53–87. All Sanskrit fragments published by the German scholars from 1904 to 1964 are listed in Waldschmidt's *Sanskrit handschriften aus des Turfanfunden*, Wiesbaden, 1965, XXVI–XXXII (for the years from 1964 to 1970, see ibid., 275–76). Sanskrit fragments of the Pelliot collection have been listed by Bernard Pauly in *Journal Asiatique* (1965), 83–121, 183–87, (1966) 245–304, (1961) 231–41. Yamada's *Bongo*

were discovered by Stein, Petroffsky and Otani. Hoernle recorded three fragments of this text found at Khadalik, one edited by F.W. Thomas and the other two by Lüders. Kern edited the fragments of this text collected by Petroffsky from Kashgar and wrote that "it is much more prolix, and in the material parts, the verses followed after a different order but the most striking difference is in the language of the prose parts and that there are most Prakritisms and wrongly Sanskritised expression than those in the Nepalese manuscripts".

As a result of the efforts of S. Oldenberg, M. Berezovsky, N. Krotkov and others the Russian Academy of Sciences came to possess a rich collection of Buddhist texts in Sanskrit and Khotanese, mostly from Kashgar and Khotan. Credit for compiling this manuscript collection went largely to N. Petroffsky. S. Oldenberg succeeded in identifying a number of Sanskrit Buddhist texts which he published in the Bulletin of the Oriental Department of the Russian Archaeological Society. He published more than thirty fragments from Petroffsky's collection. His colleagues, Mironov and Stael-Holstien also contributed much to the Central Asian Buddhist studies. The manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* which Kern consulted from the Leningrad collection was known as McCartney manuscript.[99] The Leningrad collection contains approximately 100 other fragments of different *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* copies. It should be mentioned in this connection that after the death of S. Oldenberg, work on Leningrad collection was neglected until the early 1950s, when V.S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky revived the studies. He succeeded in identifying several important Sanskrit and Khotanese texts, some of which he was able to bring out before his untimely death. Among important specimens of the Leningrad collection mention should be made of the *Kaśyapaparivarta* in Sanskrit so far known from Stael-Holstein's transliteration,[100] the unpublished fragments of *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*,[101] a complete version of *Dharmaśarīra*,[102] fragment of *Samā-*

butter no sobunken, Kyoto,1959 contains lists of Sanskrit fragments belonging to the London, Leningrad and Japan collections.

[94]Pischel was the first to edit its portions under the title *Die Turfan Recensions des Dharmapada* in 1908. Stein's fragments of it were introduced by Lévi in 1910 and published by Valleé Poussin in 1912. The whole text of the Pelliot manuscript was later edited and published by N.P. Chakravarti, *L'Udānavarga Sanskrit*, Paris, 1930.

dhirājasûtra,[103] a few *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscripts, many texts of the Dhāraṇi type,[104] etc.

The finds of manuscripts in Central Asia include fragments not only of Sanskrit texts, but also translations of Indian works in Central Asiatic languages like the Uigur, the Sogdian, the Kuchean and the Khotanese. During the first two decades of the twentieth century the Buddhist texts in Uigurian language were published by H. Stönner, F.W.K. Muller and W. Radloff and subsequently by W. Bang and A. von Gabain. The Sogdian versions of the Buddhist texts were edited and translated by R. Gauthoit, E. Leumann, R. Reichlet and M. Leumann. The Kuchean fragments were studied by Lévi and Hoernle. As early as in 1912 E. Leumann made transliteration of several Khotanese Buddhist texts which were also studied by Konow and Hoernle. The Khotanese Mahayanic texts were collected by H.W. Bailey in five volumes under the title *Khotanese Texts* (1951 ff.). The Khotanese manuscripts of the Leningrad collection were worked out by V.S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky during the fifties.[105] New folios of the Khotanese 'Manuscript E' which belong to the oldest category of the Leningrad collection and some previously unpublished fragments have been published by L. Gertsenberg. The recent find of a fragment of the Khotanese version of the *Dharmaśarīra* deserves special mention. Although it shows affinity with H. Stönner's aforesaid Sanskrit text, it is based on a different Sanskrit original.[106]

V

In the preceding sections we have been able to describe the extent of Buddhist textual studies. During the first fifty years of Buddhist research the various traditions, so widely different from one another, in connection with the sources of Buddhism had been clarified. The legendary data in regard to the life and achievements of the Buddha had been examined with the purpose of making a distinction between the mythical and historical elements contained in them. Attempt were also made to settle up the question of the chronology of Buddhism and to distinguish a primitive Buddhism from the doctrines grossly altered at a later period. The growth of different Buddhist sects and their doctrines, the rise of the Mahāyāna with its increasing emphasis on the negation of the world, and a corresponding mythological development to this speculative philosophy, were also brought to light. It was also demonstrated that early Buddhism was by its very nature was opposed to Brahmanism and that its followers formed a congregation, the object of which was to realise a perfect life into which members were admitted only after the performance of certain vows and rites and from which they could not return without becoming renegades. The historical process through which the geographical expansion of Buddhism outside India was possible was also understood to a considerable extent.

[103]It corresponds to ch. 27 of the Gilgit version of the Sûtra.

[104]See G.M. Bongard-Levin, M.I. Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya, E.N. Tyomkin in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, X, 1967, 150 ff.

[105]Manuscripts in Central Asian Writings (in Russian), *Uchenïye Zapïsky Institute Vostokovedeniya*, XVI, Moscow, 1958, 280–308.

[106]G.M. Bongard-Levin, *Studies in Ancient India and Central Asia*, Calcutta, 1971, 234 ff.

E. Conze divided the course of Buddhist researches into three distinct schools: the older Anglo-German School of Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenberg which based itself solely on the Pali canon, believed to have preserved the Buddha's doctrines more faithfully than any other; the Russian School headed by Minayeff, Rosenberg, Stcherbatsky and others which depended on the scholastic literature of Buddhism and interpreted its different aspects in close dependence not only on the Indian commentaries but also on the continuous living tradition of Tibet, Mongolia, China and Japan; and the Franco-Belgian School headed by Lévi, Valleé Poussin, Przyluski and others which continued on the Russian line but used other sources also supplementing their philosophical and philological analysis with the data of ethnology, sociology, etc. This division was based upon preference and insistence of each school of scholars in relation to the typical nature of the source materials they were in the habit of use. In the earlier stages of Buddhist research, the comparative study of Sanskrit and Pali redactions was made for settling the question of their relative age and authority, and accordingly Sanskrit came to be regarded as the sacred language of the Northern Buddhists (i.e. those of Nepal, Tibet, China, Japan, Vietnam, Cambodia and Indonesia) while Pali as that of the Southern (i.e. of Ceylon, Burma and Siam).

The changes that have taken place in the study of Buddhism are largely due to the piecemeal way in which the original documents have been brought to light. Remusat and Schmidt, the predeces-

mentary Vinayas of different schools also point to the same.[113] The present forms of the texts and, where texts are not available, or available only in fragments, those of the translations, bear testimony of additions, interpolations and accretions, and since there was no centralised control to prevent this, they came to disagree on numerous points. But we are not in a position to give a categorical answer to the question whether the disagreements effected the fundamental doctrines.

The researches of Franklin Edgerton on Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit have also thrown some significant light on the process of the formation of Buddhist canon,[114] and evoked much interest among the Scholars. Akira Yuyama in his *Bibliography of the Sanskrit Texts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, Canberra, 1970, 80–81, recorded 19 reviews of Edgerton's *Grammar and Dictionary* and several articles written in its reaction. His views had been seriously discussed, often with criticisms, by Helmer Smith, E. Waldschmidt, Heinz Bechert and Franz Bernhard. Edgerton divided the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit into three classes; the first containing texts entirely in Hybrid Sanskrit; the second containing verses in Hybrid Sanskrit but the prose portion showing few signs of Middle Indic phonology and morphology with vocabulary basically of Hybrid Sanskrit: and the third containing text Sanskritised, the vocabulary only showing relics of Hybrid Sanskrit tradition. From this he concluded that the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit tradition went back to the early Buddhist canon which was originally composed in a middle India language containing dialect mixture.

The mixture of dialects was subjected to a process of Sanskritisation when the Buddhist Hybrid texts were written. Borough, Renou and Regamey agreed on this point with Edgerton, but they were not willing to accept that the prose of the works of the second class and the works of the third class belonged to the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit tradition. According to them these texts were written in a class of Sanskrit which contains some elements of Hybrid

[113]See also E. Mayeda, *History of the Formation of the Original Buddhist Texts*, Tokyo, 1964.

[114]F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, New Haven, 1953. For his articles on Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit see *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, I, 1936, 65–83; *BSOAS*, VIII, 1936, 501–16; *K. Sastri Com. Vol.*, Madras 1936, 39–45; *Language*, XIII, 1937, 107–22; XXII, 1946, 94–102; *JAOS*, LVII, 1937, 16–34, 185–88; LXVI, 1946, 197–206; LXXII, 1952, 114–17; LXXVII, 1957, 227–32. For a complete bibliography of Edgerton's publication see *Language*, XI, 1964, 116–23.

forms. Another objection raised against Edgerton in his use of Nepalese manuscripts, scribal errors of which were likely to be confused with Hybrid Sanskrit. According to Edgerton in the case of such texts as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, the *Vajracchedika* or the *Udānavarga* the Central Asian manuscripts show a more Mid-India appearance than the Nepalese manuscripts, but Regamey holds that these texts were not submitted to a process of Sanskritisation, but copyists had corrected the texts. These problems may however, be studied in greater details only when all the fragments from Gilgit and Central Asia and also the Nepalese manuscripts will be properly edited. One should not fail to recall in this connection that Edgerton has insisted on a Mid-India vernacular as the original language of the Buddhist canon. This goes against the view of H. Lüders who maintained that portions of the Pali and Sanskrit canon were translated from an earlier Ardhamāgadhī source.

It is not an exaggeration to state that the doctrines ascribed to the Buddha are better known than the details of his life. Scholars in this field have tried to separate facts from legends, but the extent and nature of their success have not been fully established from a purely historical point of view. The Buddha legends were first handled by B.H. Hodgson who published in 1880 a sketch of Buddhism with references to some aspects of the Buddha's career. The next was Alexander Csoma de Koros whose *Notices on the Life of Shakya extracted from the Tibetan Authorities* came out in 1836. Works and collection of Hodgson and Csoma were the main sources of Eugine Burnouf's *Introduction a l'Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien* (1844) in which he considered the Buddha as a deified human being of uncertain identity. The next important work was Anton Schiefner's abridged translation (1845) of a Tibetan work on the life of the Buddha which was chiefly based on the legendary *Lalitavistara*. In 1847 was published Ph.E. Foucaux's *Rgya-Tcher-Rd-pa* which was the French translation of the *Lalitavistara* from Tibetan. The emphasis on Sanskrit Mahayanic tradition, on which the Tibetan and Chinese sources are mainly based, did not help very much in reconstructing a historical biography of Buddha. Spence Hardy's *Eastern Monachism* (1850, rep. 1853, 1866) which dealt with the life of Buddha on the basis of Simhalese sources had little to do with historical understanding. The same held good in the case of P. Bigandet's *Life or Legend of Gaudama, the Buddha of the Burmese* (1858) which was practically an English translation of the Burmese

translation of a Pali work entitled *Mālālaṅkaravatthu* (previously translated by Chester Bennet in 1853). These works, although presented some materials of the Buddha's career, were not sufficient to establish his human existence. Thus H.H. Wilson in his 'Buddha and Buddhism' (*JRAS*, 1856, 229 ff.) held that "it is not impossible after all that Śākya Muni was an unreal being, and that all that is related of him is as much a fiction as that of his preceding migrations." V.P. Vasilev in his *Buddhizm: ego dogmati, istorya i literatura* (1859) and E. Schlagintweit in his *Buddhism in Tibet* (1863) preferred to keep themselves silent on the question of the historicity of the Buddha. On the other hand C.F. Köppen (who was a close friend of Karl Marx and F. Engels and probably supplied the latter the matter of an interesting paragraph on Buddhism found in his *Dialectics of Nature*) in his *Religion des Buddha* (2 vols., 1857) went many steps forward, even far beyond the range of speculation that might be provided through the then available materials, and declared that the Buddha was not only a historical person but also he was a great emancipator of the oppressed, the greatest revolutionary and the greatest political innovator of his time.

A few other European scholars like Schoebel in his *La Buddha et la Bouddhisme* (1857), Berthelemy Saint Hilaire in his *Le Buddha et sa Religion* (1860/, Eng. trans., 1895), T.D. Alwis in his *Buddhism: Its Origin, History and Doctrine* (1862), H. Alabaster in his *Wheel of Law* (1872, based on Siamese sources) and L. Feer in his articles published between 1866 and 1878 in the *Journal Asiatique*, felt the problem of the Buddha's historical biography more seriously. Volume one of V. Fousbōll's *Jātaka*, T.W. Rhys Davids's *Buddhist Birth Stories* (1878, being the translation of the *Nidānakathā*), S. Beal's *Romantic Legends of Sakya Buddha* (1875), W. Rockhill's *Life of Buddha* (1884) etc. are all based on mythical and legendary traditions. Among all such works Senart's *Essai sur legende du Buddha* (1875) is most important. According to Senart, a Buddha might have lived somewhere at some period, but the Buddha of whom the Buddhist tradition speaks had never lived. This Buddha was an allegorical figure who was originally a Sun-god. Like the sun issuing from the clouds of night, the Buddha was produced from the dark womb of Māyā. The death of Māyā, immediately after the birth of the Buddha, resembled the vanishing of the morning cloud before the sun's rays. Like the sun-hero conquering the thunder-demon the Buddha vanquished Māra and after his victory he set in motion the

'Wheel of Law' that marched triumphantly across the firmament, until at last the day declined and the sun-god succumbed to darkness. The destruction of the Śākyas was the dying away of the power of sun in the blood-red tents of evening clouds.

Although Hopkins[115] ridiculed the view of Senart by saying that even the career of Napoleon or Max Müller could also be explained in terms of a sun-myth, the facts remain that, the current legendary narratives cannot help any serious scholar to put his trust upon the historical existence of the Buddha. J.H.C. Kern in his *Geschiedents van hat Buddhisme in Inde*[116] (1882–84) had followed a line similar to that of Senart and reduced the whole thing into an astronomical account. According to him the twelve *nidānas* symbolised the twelve months, the six heretical teachers, the planets, rebellion of Devadatta, the struggle between the sun and the moon, and so forth. The view of Kern was to a great extent supported by Barth who did not even hesitate to consider courtesans as the mother-goddesses. In 1915, R.O. Franke[117] observed: "I should not wish to make it appear as if I believed that we know even the very least about the founder of this doctrine. Naturally somebody (or sombodies) has (or have) created it, otherwise it would not be there. But who this somebody was, and whether there were not rather several somebodies, we have no knowledge". The following observation of E.J. Thomas (1927)[118] is significant: "The matter, stands just as in the case of any historical person, say Socrates, Muhammad or Bonaparte. We have many records, many related facts, dates and archaeological remains, as well as the actually existing Buddhist peoples with their systems. Do these data point to an origin in the growth and spread of a myth in which the religious belief in a god has been gradually converted into an apparently historical event, or is the basis of a historical person who lived in the sixth century B.C.?" In 1947 Lamotte in his *Legende du Bouddha*[119] held that since the Buddha legends have no tinge of reality what the historians can do in this field is not to extract history from these legends, but to stratify the legends and remain content by studying their successive stages. But in his successive

[115] *Religions of India*, 1895, 229.

[116] German trans., 1884, French trans., 1901–03.

[117] *ZDMG*, 1915, 455.

[118] *Life of Buddha*, rev. ed., 1949, 233.

[119] *Revue de l'historie des Religions*, CXXIV, 31–71.

work, *Histoire du Buddhisme Indien* (1958) he was to some extent inclined to insist on the historical existence of the Buddha as a reality, although side by side he pointed out that the Buddhist texts were unable to give any definite clue to the proper understanding of the actual happenings of the Buddha's life.

In 1881 H. Oldenberg's *Buddha, sein Leben, seine Lehre, seine Gemeinde* was published from Berlin (Eng. trans., 1882 by W. Hoey) in which he asserted that the insistence should not be on the so called gaps in the career of the Buddha or on the legendary elements, but to see whether our total knowledge of the Buddha and his doctrines obtained so far from reliable, semi-reliable and unreliable sources, fits with the historical conditions of the sixth century B.C. He pointed out that the Buddhist ideas were not stranger to those of Brahmanism. Rather Brahmanical speculations anticipated Buddhism in diction as well as in thought. The problem of the early Brahmanical speculations was to define the relation between *ātman* and the external world. A painful world, full of hunger and thirst, sorrow and confusion, old age and death, when equated with the all perfect, all-pervading and the all-beautiful *ātman* would naturally give birth to absolute pessimism, the conception of metempsychosis, the endless cycles of births and deaths, and finally the doctrine of *karman* as the power of predetermining the course of the migration of soul from one state of being to another. Even the reward of good action is impermanent which arises out of some kind of desire and hence the doctrine of deliverence gradually came to be based upon the conquest of all desire through the knowledge of the impermanence of everything. And this is what was taught by the Buddha.[120] In finding out Bhahmanical speculative elements in Buddhism Oldenberg was completely successful. But there were others who held that the Buddhist texts and commentaries were mainly composed by the Brāhmaṇas, since they were the scholarly class through the ages, and that they employed their traditional terms and concepts in interpreting the essentials of Buddhism. There might also have been conscious or unconscious attempts to fabricate the one in the light of the other, like the mixing of milk with mango juice, and in doing so the mango-seed, which was original Buddhism, was probably thrown away. The Brahmanical doctrinal elements so laboriously pointed out by Oldenberg and regarded as the natural culmination of a

[120] *Buddha*, 1882, 16–59; cf. H. Kern, *Manual of Indian Buddhism*, 1896, 11–12.

running thought process may be explained in terms of such fabrications. This view was upheld not only by scholars dependent on Sanskrit or Sanskritic tradition like Stcherbatsky or Vallée Poussin but also by eminent Palists like Mrs. C.A.F. Rhys Davids.

In her thought-provoking *Gotama the Man* (1928) and *Śākya or Buddhist Origins* (1931) C.A. F. Rhys Davids raised the all important question: What was the original message of Buddhism? According to her the Pali texts represented the monkish thoughts of times much later than the Buddha's and if we were to discover his original teachings we must extract it from the scriptures by a process of criticism and discrimination. She believed that fragments of these teachings could be discovered here and there in the Pali canon and differentiated from the surrounding material. She held that this differentiation must lead to the earliest period which was so different from the picture known from the existing records that she preferred to call it Śākya and not Buddhism. The name of Buddhism had become connotative of the later monkish accretions on a primitive tribal and unsophisticated kernel which was originally Śākya. The idea in itself was very stimulating and Mrs. Rhys Davids was quite right in upholding the conception of a primitive Buddhism. Unfortunately her works exhausted themselves in the most masterly and critical analysis of the sources and in brilliant outlining of methodology, but very little was done about the reconstructed form of the primitive Śākya religion on which she laid so much emphasis. Her insistence on the social basis of ideas is, however, a very important point which should be specially noted. Polish scholars like Maryla Falk, St. Schayer and C. Regamey tried to penetrate into what they called 'Pre-canonical Buddhism'. They assumed that wherever the canon contained ideas which clashed with the orthodox theories of the Theravādins and Sarvāstivādins, and wherever these ideas were taken up and developed by the Mahāyāna, it meant dealing with a very old 'pre-canonical' tradition, which was too venerable to be discarded by the compilers of the canon.[121]

V.P. Vasilev (1859) held that Buddhism in the totality of its development could be understood only from Tibetan and Chinese

[121] St. Schayer, 'Pre-Canonical Buddhism' in *Archiv Orientalni*, VII, 1935, 121–32; 'New Contribution to the Problem of pre-Hinayanic Buddhism' in *Polish Bulletin of Oriental Studies*, I, 1937, 8–17; cf. C. Regamey (K. Regamoy), *Der Buddhismus Indien*, 1951; art in *Roeznik Orientalisticzny*, XXI, 1957, 37–58.

sources in addition to the Indian ones. This enabled him to determine the exact meaning of the crucial term Śūnyatā in which he had discovered under a dialectical terminology an idea similar to the absolute idealism of the West. Minayeff in his *Recherches* (1894) tried to establish the exact meaning of the basic technical terms of the system and held that the three principal terms—referred to one and the same system of pluralistic empiricism—were the core of early Buddhism. These terms were *dharma* meaning 'elements of existence', *saṃskāra* meaning 'co-operating elements of existence' and *pratītyasamutpāda* meaning 'co-operation of the elements of existence. O. Rosenberg in his *Problems of Buddhist Philosophy* (1924) held that Buddhism in the three main forms of its development was nothing but a theory of *dharma*-s, i.e., a system of a plurality of ultimate elements of reality. Stcherbatsky (1927) made a further development of this *dharma* theory in close dependence with the scholastic literature. According to him although late, the *Abhidharmakośa* of Vasubandhu was a systematic exposition of a much earlier work which preserved the original doctrine, the *dharma* theory as the basis of all forms of Buddhism and the starting point of all later developments. By *dharma* is meant a fundamental principle, viz. the idea that existence is an interplay of a plurality of subtle, ultimate, and not further analysable elements of matter, mind and force. We do not know of any form of Buddhism without this doctrine and its corollary classification of elements into *skandha, āyatana* and *dhātu*, and the law of their interconnection *(pratītyasamutpāda)*. According to Stcherbatsky,[122] this doctrine of elements was current in pre-Buddhistic systems and in Buddhism they got a changed significance. The idea of self or soul as a psychological entity, arising out of the rudimentary doctrine of elements was not unknown in the earlier traditions. But the idea of an immortal soul was quite unknown to the Vedas and the older Upaniṣads. The new conception of immortal soul, called Ātmavāda by the Buddhists, was accepted by the subsequent philosophical systems except the materialists and the Buddhists whose sole emphasis was on the older tradition with considerable amendments. By the Anātmavāda of the Buddhists we understand a pluarality of separate elements without real entity, a conception which must have been in existence in pre-Buddhist traditions. Ac-

[122]Th. Stcherbatsky, *The Central Conception of Buddhism*, Leningrad, 1927; rep., New Delhi, 1970, 65 ff.

cording to Stcherbatsky, the basis of the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna ideas was the same which drew its main impulses from the earlier traditions. To him, the origin of Buddhism, therefore, was a matter of philosophy to be tracted to the history of ideas, and the Buddha was a representative of a spiritual succession established long ago by former Buddhas.[123]

VI

The earliest article on the Buddhist sects was published in 1859 in *Journal Asiatique* by St. Julien which was followed by Vasilev's *Buddhism* (1859, German version, 1860, French version, 1865), Schiefner and Vasilev's translation and edition of Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism* (1868) which gave important identifications of the different names of the schools appearing in the lists of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva,the publication of sectarian Vinayas or their extracts by Beal (1875, 1881), Oldenberg and Rhys Davids (1881), Senart (1882), Rockhill (1884), Kern (*Geschiadenis*, 1882), etc. which threw significant light on the development of schisms and the emergence of various sects. Minayeff's *Recherches* (1884) contains details of controversial accounts of the Buddhist Councils and the growth of the sects with the conclusion that the councils had an historical value from a double point of view. They contained an ancient nucleus of an authentic tradition, i.e., discussions on the points of discipline which were not necessarily anterior to all canonical codification and resumed under the symbolical aspect of a regular council the work of compilations and arrangements of scriptures. Minayeff's insistence on the *Cullavagga* account (ch.XI) was challenged by Oldenberg in his *Buddhistiche Studien* (1898) as unhistorical and false because of its internal contradictions and of its lack of corroboration with other sources. This point was not to be easily ignored because the stories of the schisms as recorded in the texts belonging to different schools of Buddhism appeared to many scholars as more arbitrary than historical.[124]

[123]See also N.N. Bhattacharyya, 'A Note on the Historical Biography of the Buddha' in *Journal of Indian History*, LIII, 1975, 1–12; 'The Origin of Buddhism: A Survey of Important Views' in *Proceedings of the International Seminar of Buddhism and Jainism*, Cuttack, 1976, 208–15; D. Snellgrove, 'In Search of a Historical Sakyamuni' in *South East Asian Review*, VII, 1975, 151–58; A Bareau, *Recherches sur la biographie du Buddha*, Paris, 1963, 1970, 1971; Kogen Mizuno, *Primitive Buddhism*, Eng. trans., 1969.

[124]Cf. R.O. Franke in *JPTS*, 1908, 59 ff.

In 1908, Louis de la Valleé Poussin having critically examined all hitherto published materials and arguments put forward by previous scholars admitted the validity of Minayeff's conclusions about the functional reality of the earlier councils as the source of the diversification of Buddhist thoughts and practices ultimately culminating in the formation of different schools and sects in his thought-provoking article entitled *Buddhist Councils.*[125] A group of scholars, however, thought that since no proceedings of the councils as recorded in the texts did not positively assist in ascertaining the real causes and objective conditions leading to the schisms, it was better to depend on the advanced scholastic literature and to treat the whole problem strictly in terms of the doctrinal viewpoints reached by the schools in course of their historical development, an attitude which was foreshadowed in Y. Sogen's *Systems of Buddhist Thought* (1912). Interesting light on the Buddhist sects, especially on the Sarvāstivādins, was thrown by Jean Przyluski in his two works *La Legende de l'Empereur Aśoka* (1923)[126] and *Le Concile de Rājagṛha* (1926).[127] In the first work the author had adduced convincing grounds for believing that the traditions found in the *Aśokāvadāna* were older than those in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and that three phases in the history of the progress of Buddhism and the Buddhist Church could be distinguished and specified as Magadha, Mathura and Kashmir phases respectively. In the second work he had given French translations of the accounts of the First Council as found in the *Kia-Yeh-Kie-King* (Sūtra on Kaśyapa's collection of the *Tripiṭaka)* and also in *Ta-che-tu-Luen.* Here he had shown that Kausambi and all south-western countries became later the seat of the Theravādins while Mathura and the north-western countries that of Sarvāstivādins and both these sects were opposed to the Mahāsaṅghikas whose centre was at Pāṭaliputra, Vaisali and in a later date in the Andhra Pradesh. According to Przyluski, the antiquity of the Mahīśāsakas should go back to the time of the First Council.

In 1925, J. Masuda published the translation of the Chinese version of Vasumitra's treatise on eighteen sects of Buddhism which was supplemented by the Tibetan texts on the eighteen

[125] *Indian Antiquary*, XXXVII, 1908, 1–18, 91–106.

[126] Eng. trans. by D.K. Biswas, Calcutta, 1967.

[127] A complete analytical bibliography of Przyluski's writings have been published by A.W. Macdonald and M. Lalou, *L'auvre de Jean Przyluski*, Paris, 1970.

schools by Bhavya and Vinītadeva.[128] Since then editions and translations of the sectarian works, mostly from the Tibetan and Chinese sources began to be published. We have already had the occasion to refer to them in the beginning of this chapter. In 1925, N. Dutt published *Early History of the Spread of Buddhism and the Buddhist Schools* which was a general study on the Buddhist sects in which an historical background, the chronological problems, the epigraphical and literary evidences, origin and home of the sects, the history of a few important sects and kindred subjects had been discussed in detail. In Dutt's opinion, the great schism in the Buddhist Saṅgha was due mainly to the five dogmas of Mahādeva than to the divergences of the Vinaya rules, because the former indicated that Arhats were not fully perfect persons as was the view of the orthodox Theravādins. Texts of various traditions were comparatively studied also in M. Walleser's *Die Sekten des Alten Buddhismus* which came out from Heidelberg in 1927. Valleé Poussin's edition and translation of Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* along with Yaśomitra's commentary from *Tibetan Sources* (1923–31), Lévi's Study of the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* (1929), Paul Demieville's study on the Chinese sources in his *L'Origine des sectes bouddhiques d'apres Paramārtha* (1931-32), Obermiller's English translation of Bu Ston's *History of Buddhism* (1932), Lamotte's translation of Vasubandhu's *Kramasiddhiprakaraṇa* (1936) etc. threw important light on sectarian studies.

In 1946, M. Hōfinger[129] came to the conclusion that the Council of Vaisali was not a fiction and that the existing sources were nothing but the revised and amplified versions of a very old tradition. The account of the conflict about the disciplinary rules between the monks of Vaisali and the rest of the community was almost identical in all the Vinaya texts and it assumed the existence of a pre-canonical or proto-canonical account very close to the time of its occurrence.[130] Other traditions, claiming various causes of dissension,

[128] J. Masuda, 'Origins and Doctrines of Early Indian Buddhist Schools' in *Asia Major*, II, 1925, 1–78.

[129] 'Etude sur la concil de Vaisali' in *Le Museon*, XX, 1946.

[130] Cf. Pa-Chow, *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa*, Santiniketan, 1955. Hirakawa's (*Rissuzo no Kenkyu*, Tokyo, 1960) study shows that the Chinese recension of the Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya, when compared with the that of the Theravāda, reveals close agreement in regard to the Prātimoksa rules which indicates that during the first schism both of them remained conservative, but their offshoots became unorthodox.

were superimposed later. The growth of such traditions might well be divided into two classes, independent of each other, the first being represented by the account of Mahāsaṅghika Vinaya, which was the oldest according to Höfinger, and the second by the accounts in other Vinaya texts. The singular original was eastern and the others introduced new divergences in their traditions. Chronologically the traditions of the Mahāsaṅghikas and the Mūlasarvāstivādins were the earliest, those belonging to the Dharmaguptakas were later accretions, those of the Theravādins and the Mahiśāsakas were still later and the Himavatas were the latest. A. Bareau's *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques* (1955) suggested that Aśoka was associated with the Sthaviravāda school which was threatened during his reign with a schism of the Sarvāstivādins. The Theravāda tradition did not record it as a schism but simply as the expulsion of some dissident monks. The main points of difference probably centred round the understanding and interpretation of the Abhidharma, as was indicated by the basic difference between the world-view of the Sarvāstivādins and that of the Sthaviras.[131] Bareau's *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Vehicule* (1955), one of the authoritative works on the Buddhist sects dealt with different traditions about the origin of the sects and divided them chronologically in three epochs, the first consisting of the sects mentioned in the Ceylonese *Dīpavaṃsa*; the second of those mentioned in the Sāmmitīya tradition of Bhavya; and the third of those mentioned in the Kashmirian sources like the Chinese translation of *Sāriputraparipṛcchā* of the Mahāsaṅghikas, the *Samayabhedoparacanacakra* of Vasumitra and *Mañjuśrīparipṛcchā* available only in Chinese translation. Bareau was not inclined to contribute to the idea of Lin-Li-Louang that there were two groups of the Mahāsaṅghikas, the northern having liberal disciplinary views and Mahayanic leanings and the southern claiming origin from the Sthaviras and Vātsiputriyas.

E. Lamotte in his *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien* (1958) suggested that some time during the period of the great schism and differences of opinion which continued even after the time of Aśoka, the Vātsiputras made extensive studies on the Abhidharma and the differences of interpretations gave rise at least to four new schools, each of which appended its own interpretation to the sections on Abhidharma. These four new schools were known as Dharmot-

[131]Cf. L. Alsdorf in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, III, 1959, 161–74; H. Bechert in *Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde Sud-und Ostasiens*, V, 1961, 18–52.

tarīya, Bhadrayānīya, Sāmmitīya and Sannagārika. It was roughly in the same period that the Mahāsaṅghika school produced a new offshoot called the Lokottaravādins. Lamotte has also furnished us with a tabular statement of the geographical distribution of several schools on the basis of the inscriptions discovered so far. A.K. Warder's *Indian Buddhism* (1970) traces the development of the eighteen schools of early Buddhism and tries to show that all the eighteen schools of early Buddhism elaborated their doctrines out of a common kernel. It also deals with the geographical distribution of the sects vis-à-vis their relation to the doctrinal peculiarities of each of them and throws significant light especially on the Sthaviravādins, Caitikas, Lokottaras, Bahuśrutīyas and Sarvāstivādins, in terms of the socio-political conditions of the Ceylonese, Sātavāhana and Kuṣāṇa kingdoms and the art activities of the period. Sectarian migrations or expansions in south-east Asia have also been dealt with. N. Dutt's *Buddhist Sects* (1970), a revised and enlarged version of his earlier work mentioned above, is an analytical study of the treatises of Vasumitra, Bhavya and Vinītadeva, and also of the *Kathāvatthu* and its commentary by Buddhaghoṣa as well as of the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā*, the *Sāmmitīyanikāya Śāstra* and the *Gilgit manuscripts* containing the original Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya. Among the more recent studies, S.N. Dube's *Cross Currents in Early Buddhism* (1980) is mostly based on the *Kathāvatthu* and the sources we have already mentioned in connection with N. Dutt's aforesaid work. It seeks to elucidate the controversies presented in the *Kathāvatthu* in the light of the historical development of Buddhist thought and its wider milieu. This work not only analyses the doctrinal significance of the points discussed but connects them historically with specific tendencies in the growth of the Buddhist sects, their practice and organisation. It also correlates Buddhist developments with similar developments in other contemporary schools.

So far as the Mahāyāna Buddhism is concerned, the works published between the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth[132]—besides the earlier works of Burnouf, Vasilev, Minayeff, Stcherbatsky, Lévi, Poussin and others—no doubt purport to present in a historical outline the origin and development of Mahāyānic, ideas and practices, but the vast and

[132]S. Kuroda, *Outlines of Mahāyāna*, London, 1893; D.T. Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*, London, 1907; W.M. McGovern, *Introduction to Mahāyāna Buddhism*, London, 1922; R. Kimura, *Historical Studies of the Terms Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna*

varied theoretical formulations as found in the scholastic literature of the Mahāyāna, the immense mythological and cultic speculations, the ritualistic intricacies deriving their ingredients from varied levels of culture, and many other allied components, point to the fact that it is not a single homogeneous system. It is generally believed that Mahāyānism is characterised by (i) the conception of Bodhisattva, (ii) the practice of the Pāramitās, (iii) the development of Bodhicitta, (iv) the ten stages of spiritual progress, (v) the goal of Buddhahood, (vi) the conception of Trikāya, and (vii) the conception of Dharma-śūnyatā or Dharmasamatā or Tathatā, and that these are the developments of certain earlier ideas held by the Mahāsaṅghikas which have been finally culminated in the elaborate system of Mahāyāna through a historical process. In the case of certain ideas this may hold good, but the Mahāyāna as a whole cannot be the development of the ideas inherent in the Hīnayāna or in any of its schools. Earlier scholars believed that a popular religion based on the cult of Buddha—regarded as the Supreme Being, the all-pervading entity controlling the universe, the ultimate reality existing as the basic ingredient and true nature of everything, often conceived of as having a celestial or divine form and incarnating himself in human form for the sake of the welfare a beings—existing from hoary antiquity had in course of its long survival associated itself with numerous beliefs and ideas, rituals and practices, and these superimposed elements, very often having no link with each other, came to be designated under the general title 'Mahāyāna'. Although this view has received quite a diminishing importance among the scholars of the subsequent period, it can not be rejected at once. Rather this view point has the probability of explaining many a baffling and heterogeneous element which developed as accretions on an original kernel, based on a primitive cult of the Buddha. The study of Mahāyāna even in its philosophical level has also been handicapped by confusing and contradictory elements inherent in each line of thought. At the same time the technical terms of Mahāyāna offer serious problems in the understanding of their real and correct implications. As a result, much of the works done so far in different aspects of the Mahāyāna has given rise to endless debates and controversies, a

and Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism, Calcutta, 1927; N. Dutt, *Aspects of Mahāyāna Buddhism and Its Relation to Hīnayāna*, London, 1930; B.L. Suzuki, *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, London, 1938; etc.

sort of modern scholasticism in the place of the ancient one, yielding no tangible result.

The concept of *nirvāṇa*, one of the vital problems of Buddhism, which was previously studied by Gogerly, Spence Hardy, Bigandet, Burnouf, D'Alwis, Vasilev, Köpen, Childers, Obry, Rhys Davids, Frankfürter, et al., was subsequently interpreted by Dahlmann, Eklund, Valleé Poussin and Stcherbatsky.[133] Studies in the philosophical aspects of Buddhism got a fresh start with the publication of the works of Max Wallesser,[134] Sogen [135] and Rosenberg. Mrs Rhys Davids brought to light much of the Theravāda Abhidharmic conceptions. St. Schayer[136] was one of the ablest interpreters of the doctrine of void as developed by Nāgārjuna and his commentators. Stcherbatsky expounded the logical and epistemological theories while Valleé Poussin did invaluable work in making accessible the Abhidharma of the Indian schools and the intricacies of Vijñānavāda.[137] O. Rosenberg's *Die Probleme der budhistische philosophie* (1924) formulated a special *dharma* theory, doctrine of the elements, as the basic ingredient of all forms of Buddhist system, and the views expressed in this work subsequently became the guideline of the Russian school. The relation between the Sāṅkhya and Buddhism has been dealt with by J.W. Hauer in his *Das Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra und das Sāṅkhya* (1927). On the earlier works on different schools of Buddhist philosophy reference should be made to J. Masuda's *Der individualistische Idealismus der Yogācāra-Schule* (1926), G. Tucci's *On Some Aspects of the Doctrines of Maitreya and Asaṅga* (1930), etc. In 1938, the Rev. Nāṅatiloka, a German Buddhist monk, gave us a useful book under the title *Guide through the Abhidhamma Piṭaka*. Subsequently, however, the Abhidharmas of different schools were handled from various viewpoints, and a variety of new interpretations were added. Of such works giving

[133]Obry, *Du Nirvaṇa Bouddhique*, 1863; J. Dahlmann, *Nirvāṇa*, 1886; J.A. Eklund, *Nirvāṇa en religious-historisk undersökening*, 1899, Valleé Poussin, *Nirvāṇa*, 1923; Th. Stcherbatsky, *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, 1927, etc. See especially Guy Welbon's *The Buddhist Nirvāṇa and its Western Interpreters*, 1968.

[134]Max Wallesser, *Die buddhistische Philosophie*, 1904–14.

[135]Y. Sogen, *Systems of Buddhist Thought*, 1912.

[136]St. Schayer, *Vorarbiten zur Geschichte der Mahāyānistischen*, 1921.

[137]In 1923 three important works containing general informations under the framework of an historical process were published: McGovern's *Manual of Buddhist Philosophy*, Keith's *Buddhist Philosophy of India and Ceylon*, and Oltramare's *La theosophie Bouddhique*.

new interpretations to Abhidharma contents reference may be made to H.C. Guenther's *Philosophy and Psychology of Abhidharma* (1951).

Some scholars wanted to visualise Buddhism in the context of the problems of the modern world, and there were also some who wanted to understand the concepts of Buddhism in terms of modern philosophical language. Stcherbatsky had a personal bias for the philosophy of Kant and found in Buddhism the Kantian concepts like 'thing-in-itself', 'the schematism of categories', 'the synthesis of apperception' and so on. In the writings of medieval Buddhist philosophers he had discovered Bergson's 'duration', Russell's 'sense data' and a host of ideas of European philosophy. Among other works of this category mention should be made of P. Dhalke's *Buddhist Essays* (1908), *Buddhism and Science* (1927) and *Buddhism and Its Place in the Mental Life of Mankind* (1927); E. Holme's *Creed of Buddha* (1908); G. Grimm's *Die Wissenschaft des Buddhismus* (1923); etc. D. Goddard's *Buddha's Golden Path* (1929) was a manual of practical Buddhism based on the teachings and practices of the Zen sect of Japan but interpreted and adopted to meet the modern conditions. Among works intended for the non-specialists mention should be made of J. Takakusu's *Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy* (published posthumously in 1947), C.L.A. de Silva's *Four Essential Doctrines of Buddhism* (1948), V.N. Mahāthera's *Buddhism Outlined* (1951) etc. E. Conze's *Buddhism: Its Essence and Development* (1951) shows the progress of Buddhist ideas from the beginning to their later ramifications. Conze has a strong Mahāyānic bias, but his interpretation of the Mādhyamika system is basically different from those of others. According to him, Nāgārjuna's doctrine is not metaphysical at all, but it describes a practical attitude of non-assertion. In his subsequent works in connection with his researches on the Prajñāpāramitā literature and other aspects of Mahāyānism he tried to show that Buddhism from its very beginning upheld a doctrine of mystic experience to be attained by its followers through the symbolism of rituals, and this approach became popular among some later writers in this field.

T.R.V. Murti's *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* (1955) is based on an exposition of Candrakīrti's viewpoint. How far the Mādhyamika doctrine may claim to become the central philosophy of Buddhism, whether the strikingly negative character of the Mādhyamika doctrine, supposed to annihilate every concept of

conventional knowledge, including the rejection of the theory of dependent origination, is a denial of Buddhism itself, or whether this negation in itself is essentially positive in implying a reality quite impossible to understand on any intellectual terms is in agreement with the original teachings of the Buddha, all these questions have been taken into account from a purely philosophical point of view in this work, the first part of which deals with the origin and development of Mādhyamika philosophy, the second with the dialectic as system of philosophy and third with the Mādhyamika and the allied systems including some Western ones. In the field of Vijñānavāda, A.K. Chatterjee's *Yogācāra Idealism* (1962) describes how the followers of Yogācāra refute the objections to idealism put forward by the realists, and elucidates the three *vijñānas*, the *dharma* of Yogācāra, the concept of Tathāgata, the Yogācāra and some other forms of absolutism, and the Yogācāra contrasted with other forms of idealism. In his subsequent *Readings on Yogācāra Buddhism* (1971) he has taken the subject in a wider perspective. Yogācāra philosophy has also been the subject of research for C.L. Tripathi (1974).[138] Works on comparative philosophical analysis are also significant.[139] R.C. Jha's *Vedāntic and Buddhist Concept of Reality as interpreted by Śaṅkara and Nāgārjuna* (1973) belonged to this category. K. Venkataramanan's *Nāgārjuna's Philosophy* explained the basic conceptions of Mahāyāna Buddhism as found in the *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra*. Of other important works on different aspects of Buddhist philosophy reference should be made to K.N. Jayatilleke's *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge* (1963), J. Prasad's *History of Indian Epistemology* (1959), F. Edgerton's *Beginnings of Indian Philosophy* (1965), A.K. Sarkar's *Changing Phases of Buddhist Thought* (1968), etc. G.C.C. Chang's *Buddhist Teachings of Totality* (1972) is an exposition of the Hwa Yen Buddhism, but it is relevant to the study of Indian Buddhist philosophy. To this list should also be added R. Basu's *A Critical Study of the Milindapañho* (a critique of Buddhist philosophy, 1978). In

[138]In Hindi there are some good works on Buddhist philosophy like B.D. Upadyaya's *Bauddha-Darśana-Mīmāṃsā* (1954), C.D. Sharma's *Saugata Siddhāntasārasaṃgraha*, etc. In Bengali Ananta Kumar Bhattacharyya's *Vaibhāṣika Darśana* (1955) has attained the status of a classic.

[139]Cf. J.N. Shah, *Akalaṅka's Criticism of Dharmakirti's Philosophy* (1966); J.L. Mehta, *Vedānta and Buddhism* (1968); L.M. Joshi, *Brahmanism, Buddhism and Jainism* (1970); K.N. Upadhyaya, *Early Buddhism and Bhagavadgītā* (1970); etc.

the field of ethics, H. Siddhatissa's *Buddhist Ethics* (1970) and *The Buddhist Way* (1971) and R. Hindery's *Comparative Ethics in Hindu and Buddhist Traditions* (1978) are important recent contributions. Sukomal Chaudhuri's *Analytical Study of the Abhidharmakośa* (1983) is also a recent significant contribution to the understanding of Buddhist doctrinal intricacies.

In the field of Buddhist logic Stcherbatsky's *The Theory of Knowledge and Logic according to the Later Buddhists* (2 vols., 1903–9) was a monumental contribution. During these years excepting for Dharmakīrti's *Nyāyabindu* and Dharmottara's commentary on it, no original work on Buddhist logic was known to the academic world. Stcherbatsky therefore had to depend mainly on the Tibetan sources for the reconstruction of the Sanskrit originals, and in this way on the basis of the writings of Diṅnāga, Dharmakīrti, and a host of their commentators, the reconstruction finally culminated in his two volumes of *Buddhist Logic* (1931–32). What is most remarkable about Stcherbatsky is that long before Rahula's discovery of the *Pramāṇa-vārttika* practically the entire tradition of epistemology and logic was reconstructed by him. While Stcherbatsky was working on Buddhist logic, Satis Chandra Vidyabhushana worked on the same subject as another pioneer. Vidyabhushana, trained in Tibetan by no less a Tibetologist than Sarat Chandra Das himself, took up the work in right earnest and, showing no awareness of Stcherbatsky's work (because the earlier of these were in Russian) started reconstructing Buddhist logic from the Tibetan sources. His first monograph on this subject *History of the Medieval School of Indian Logic* appeared in 1909 and this was followed by his greater work *A History of Indian Logic* in 1921, nine years earlier than Stcherbatsky's *magnum opus*. No wonder, Stcherbatsky freely used Vidyabhushana's work, but while the latter's approach was that of a confirmed historian, the former wanted to rationalise Buddhist logic in modern terminology and to offer a vigorous philosophical defence of it. H.K. Ganguli's *Philosophy of Logical Reconstruction* (1963) was a critical examination of logical atomism and logical positivism in the light of the philosophies of Bhatṛhari, Dharmakīrti and Prajñākaragupta. The first part of R.S.Y. Chi's *Buddhist Formal Logic: A Study of Diṅnāga's Hetucakra and K'uai-Chi's great commentary on the Nyāyapraveśa* (1969) was also a significant addition to the study of Buddhist logical literature.

Studies on different aspects of Tantric Buddhism began with C.F. Koppen's *Die lamaische Hierarchie und Kirche* (1859). Vasilev's *Buddhism* (1859) contains extracts from the Avataṃsakas, Ratnakūṭas of the Dhāraṇi's of the Tibetan canon. E. Schlagintwait's *Buddhism in Tibet* (1863) contained much information on Tantric Buddhism. So did the works of Rockhill, Waddell and Sarat Chandra Das. Waddell's *The Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism* (1895) held that a cult of demoniacal Buddhas which incorporated the Mahāyāna practices and called itself Vajrayāna or thunderbolt vehicle was a coarse Tantric development of the Ādi Buddha theory combined with its puerile mysticism of Mantrayāna, and it attempted to explain creation and the secret powers of nature by the union of terrible Kāī, not only with the Dhyāni Buddhas but even with the Ādi Buddha himself. And these demoniacal Buddhas under the name Kālacakra, Heruka, Acala, Vajrabhairava, etc. were credited with powers not inferior to those of the celestial Buddhas themselves. They were to be conciliated by constant worship of themselves and their female energies, the dreadful Dākini fiendesses, all of Kālī type—with offerings and sacrifices, magic circles, special mantra-charms, etc. Tantric aspects of Tibetan Buddhism were sebsequently discussed in Grünwedel's *Mythologie des Buddhismus in Tibet und der Mongoloi* (1900) and Alice Getty's *Gods of Northern Buddhism* (1908).

B.T. Bhattacharyya's *Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism* originally published in 1924 and subsequently in an enlarged and revised form in 1932 was the theoretical culmination of his previous researches on the Buddhist texts in which he had laid down the basic principles of Tantric Buddhism. According to Bhattacharyya, the Buddhist Tantras in outward appearance resemble the Hindu Tantras to a marked degree but in reality there is very little similarity between them, either in subject-matter or in philosophical doctrines inculcated in them, or in religious principles. He also declared that the Buddhists were the first to introduce the Tantras into their religion and that the Hindus borrowed them from the Buddhists in later times. In this book he had also given an account of the Tantric Buddhist texts and their authors, mainly from the Tibetan sources, as well as a perfect description of the deities of Tantric pantheon. M.M. Bose's *Post-Caitanya Sahajiyā Cults of Bengal* (1930) demonstrated the Sahajayāna origin of numerous Bengali poems, collected by the author himself, belonging to the

Sahajiyā Vaiṣṇavism. According to him Vikramaśilā was the centre of Tantric learning which gradually spread to Bengal, Assam and Orissa. The Sahajiyā Vaiṣṇava concept of pure love as the way of realising the ultimate reality within one's own self, represented by the aspirant and his female partner, impersonating Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, is a direct adaptation of that between Upāya and Prajñā in Tantric Buddhist conception. This question of male-female union was studied in detail by W.V. Evans-Wentz in his *Tibetan Yoga and Secret Doctrines* (1935) which held that the Buddhist Tantras represented "a philosophy comprehensive enough to embrace the whole of knowledge, a system of meditation which will produce the power of concentrating the mind upon anything whatsoever, and an art of living which will enable one to utilise the activity (of body, speech and mind) as an aid on the path of liberation". Women of the world signify the elements of the psycho-physical personality representing 'the world' of Buddha. These female principles have opposite male principles. Four of the female principles form a special group representing the vital forces of the *mahābhūtas* or gross elements—earth, water, fire and air—and their corresponding psychic centres (*cakra*) or planes of consciousness within the human body. In each of them the union of male and female principles takes place until the final or the highest stage is reached. This is taught in Tilopa's famous six doctrines upon which the most important yoga method of the Kahgyupta is based.

P.C. Bagchi's *Studies in the Tantras* (1939) dealt with some aspects of Buddhist Tantric literature, the rituals of *prajñābhiṣeka* or initiation into the doctrine of *prajña*, the questions relating to the origin of Buddhist Tantra in Bhoṭadeśa, the legend of Vaśiṣṭha's visit to China in quest of Tantric knowledge and other kindred features of Tantric Buddhism. H.V. Glasenapp's *Die Entestehung des Vajrayāna* (1936)[140] dealt with the origins of Vajrayāna in which the Tantric traditions as found in Tibet and Mongolia had been compared with those found in certain schools of Japan, like the Shingnon and the Tendai, and was suggested that in the case of the latter two, the female deities figuring in the Maṇḍalas—like Prajñāpāramitā or Cundā—were sexless beings and as such there was no question of sexual association, unlike the Tantric schools of Bengal, Nepal and Tibet which emphasised the aspects of the

[140] *ZDMG*, vol. 90, 1936.

union of the male and female principles. Glasenapp's *Buddhistische Mysterien* came out in 1940. A systematic history of Vajrayāna and other forms of Tantric Buddhism that flourished in Bengal in the Pala period was given in N.N. Dasgupta's *Bāṅgalay Bauddhadharma* (in Bengali, 1949). S.B. Dasgupta's *Obscure Religious Cults as background of Bengali Literature* (1946), and *Introduction to Tantric Buddhism* (1950) also provided a highly interesting account of the origins and evolution of different forms of Tantric Buddhism and also that of the influence of Tantric Buddhism on different aspects of religious life of the subsequent period, on different heterodox and protestant sects and on ideas revealed in their literature.

Unlike B.T. Bhattacharyya, Dasgupta held that Tantrism was a very old religious undercurrent which influenced alike all the major forms of Indian religious systems, Buddhist and non-Buddhist. In the first work he dealt with the growth of Sahajiyā cults in Buddhism, the general philosophical standpoint of the Caryāpada, the religious outlook of the Buddhist Sahajiyās, the practice of the Sahajiyās and the state of supreme bliss (*mahāsukha*), the Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā cult, non-sectarian approach to the doctrines of the Sahajiyās, their influence on the Bauls of Bengal, the Nātha and Dharma cults, and allied features to cosmic speculations as revealed in the texts of these sects. The second work began with a preliminary dealing with the history of the emergence of Tantric ideas in the field of Buddhism and went on to describe the unsystematised philosophical fragments found in the Buddhist Tantras, schools of Tantric Buddhism, theological position of Tantric Buddhism, the elements of esoteric yoga inherent in Tantric Buddhism and the argument of the Tantric Buddhists in defence of their yoga.

Three of the more important strands of the Tibetan tradition have become better known in recent years—the Gelugpa by the information which Alex Wayman has provided on Tsongkhapa's *Stages on the Path of Enlightenment* (1952), the Nyingmapa through Evans Wentz's *The Tibetan Book of Great Liberation* (1954) and the Kahgyupta by H.V. Guenther's translation of Sgam-po-pa's *The Jewel Ornament of Liberation* (1959). Guenther's *Yuganaddha: The Tantric View of Life* (1952) sought to prove that the followers of Tantric Buddhism tried to view life neither as an indulgence in passion nor as an escape from it. The sexual aspects of the Tantras were nothing but the corrective against the one-sided intellectual-

ism and rationalism which was unable to cope with the problems of everyday life. The symbolic Yuganaddha (literally 'bound together or yoked together in the case of opposites') pointed to the unique harmony and interpenetration of masculinity and feminity. Man's experience and outlook could not be complete and fruitful if he had no experience of feminity. Bi-sexuality was inherent in all beings and this aspect had to be exercised in order to understand the truth of one's own nature. Sexual partnership was therefore the best expression for the most intimate relation between the two opposites. For a man woman was a material object of concentration, a goddess for meditation and a symbolic truth for comprehension. Guenther's other works were: *The Life and Teaching of Naropā* (Oxford, 1963), *Treasures on the Tibetan Middle Way* (London, 1966), and *Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice* (London, 1972).

Among other works dealing with the Tantric traditions in relation to Tibetan and Indian Buddhism mention should be made of D.N. Snellgrove's *Buddhist Himalayas* (1957), Lama Anagarika Govinda's *Foundation of Tibetan Mysticism* (1959), and G. Tucci's *Theory and Practice of the Maṇḍalas* (1961).[141] Part one of Snellgrove's *Hevajratantra* (1959) contains an introduction, English translation, contents, diagrams, glossary and index while part two contains Sanskrit and Tibetan texts and a commentary called *Yogaratnamālā*. Studies in the Maṇḍalas were also taken up by Erik Hara (1958)[142] and Ariane Macdonald. The latter made good use of Tibetan sources in her study of the second chapter of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* in her *Le Maṇḍala du Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Paris, 1962). Tsongkhapa's *Tantra in Tibet: The Exposition of the Secret Mantra*, edited and translated by Jeffrey Hopkins was published in 1977. Lessing and Wayman published translation of Mkhas-grub-rje's *Fundamentals of Buddhist Tantra* (The Hague, 1968) which was a systematic survey of Tantrism by one of Tsongkhapa's main pupils. It was subsequently re-issued as *Introduction to Buddhist Tantric Systems*. Alex Wayman's *Buddhist Tantras* (1973) attempted to present certain features of the theories and practices of Tantric Buddhism with special reference to Tibet. The Tantric concept of perfection,

[141]A complete bibliography of Tucci's writings from 1911 to 1970 is to be found in the *Opera Minora*, I, Roma, 1971, XI–XXIV.

[142]Contribution to the study of Maṇḍala and Mudrā, *Acta Orientalia*, XXIII, 57–91.

relation of the Buddhist Tantras with Mahāyāna, early literary history of the Buddhist Tantras with special emphasis on the *Guhyasamāja*, Buddhist genesis of Tantric tradition, analogical thinking in the Buddhist Tantras, nature of Buddhist esoterism, divinity, disciples, initiation materials and meanings, ritual and symbolism, twilight language, zodiac, etc. were principal subjects dealt with in this volume. In his subsequent work *Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra* (1977) Alex Wayman used, besides the published Sanskrit text, the *Pradīpoddyotana* MS relevant texts translated into Tibetan, and thirteen Tibetan works on Tantra by Tsongkhapa, the founder of the Gelugpa sect.

VII

In 1956, on the occasion of the Buddha Jayanti, a few important collections were published such as the *Buddha Jayantī Souvenir* (ed. S.L. Sharma), *2500 Years of Buddhism* (ed. P.V. Bapat), *The Path of the Buddha* (ed. K.W. Morgan), etc. In the same year and on the same occasion, the Buddhist Council of Srilanka (Laṅkā Bauddha Maṇḍalaya) with the cooperation of the Government of Srilanka, planned the publication of an *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* in 15000 pages under the general editorship of G.P. Malalasekera. This project received financial assistance from UNESCO and scholars of all countries collaborated with it. A fascicule specimen was published and distributed for opinions. Since then a few volumes of this *Encyclopaedia* have been published.

Among the historical works on Buddhism, we shall begin with Sukumar Dutt's *The Buddha and Five After Centuries* (1957) which was an attempt to present the history of Buddhism before the advent of Mahāyāna. The work was divided into four parts, the first containing the details about the founder, the second describing Buddhism in the making, the third dealing with Buddhism of the Aśokan age and the fourth with the subsequent change under the title 'the old cult in crucible'.[143] R.G. Basak's *Buddha and Buddhism* (1961) revealed the suggestivity of a few Buddhist texts on some basic questions. Thus *nirvāṇa* was interpreted from the Mahāyāna point of view; the influence of Mahāyāna Buddhism was pointed out on the *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghoṣa; the episode of fight of the Buddha with Māra was reviewed on the basis of *Mahāvastu* and the *Divyāvadāna*;

[143]We exclude from this section the works mentioned earlier in this chapter under diverse contexts.

and the changes effected by the Mahāsaṅghikas leading to Mahāyānism were discussed. An entire chapter was devoted to the *Divyāvadāna* version of Aśoka's contribution to Buddhism while in another chapter the author had discussed the ethical and philosophical teachings common to Buddhism and Brahminism and pointed out the extent to which the former was allied to the Sāṅkhya and Yoga systems.[144] A. Mitra Sastri's *Outline of Early Buddhism* (1963) was an historical survey of Buddhism, Buddhist schools and Saṃghas, mainly based on the study of inscriptions. The revised edition of Nicol Macnicol's *The Living Religions of the Indian People* (1964) contained an added chapter on Indian Buddhism written by its editor M.H. Harrison under the title: 'Buddhism in India, Its Further History and Recent Developments'. It contained, besides an introductory, the life of Buddha, his teachings, parts played in Buddhism by Aśoka and Kaṇiṣka, the Buddhist schools during the first millennium A.D. and the decline of Buddhism in India. The next imported work of this pattern was *Die Religinen Indiens*, the first part of which (III, 1964) contains detailed analysis and description of the Buddha's religion by André Bareau. It presented complicated details of different Buddhist schools. In this work Bareau had limited himself to Indian Buddhism, but he did not avoid essential references across the borders in respect to Mahāyāna and Tantrism. Besides, he had led the history of Buddhism upto the present day and added a good survey of Buddhist studies in European and Asian countries.

Lalmani Joshi's *Studies in Buddhistic Culture of India during the Seventh and Eighth Centuries AD* (1967) dealt in twelve chapters with the background and earlier developments of Buddhism; Buddhism in the seventh and eighth centuries AD, Buddhist art and monasteries; monastic life and discipline; ethical and spiritual culture; Buddhist education and its centres; Buddhist learning and literature; Buddhist philosophy and dialectics; Buddhism as viewed by Kumārila and Śaṅkara; origin and growth of esoteric Buddhism, doctrines and practices of esoteric Buddhism; and beginnings of the decline

[144]Reference should also be made in this connection to N. Ramesan's *Glimpses of Buddhism* (1961), E. Conze's *Buddhist Thought in India* (1962), K. Leidet's *Buddha Leben-Lehre Jungerscher* (1969), W. Macquity's *Buddha* (1969), E. Salisbury's *Buddhist Papers* (1972), etc. which, though do not fall under historical category proper, contain important historical informations. T.O. Ling's *Buddha* (1973) attempted in reviewing the Buddha and Buddhism from a realistic angle. It tried to show that the main concern of the person of the Buddha was the problems of his own age.

of Buddhism in India. Five appendices were on Emperor Harṣa as a Buddhist author: list of works translated by Hiuen Tsang; date of Dharmakīrti; Gauapāda's synthesis of Buddhism and Vedānta; and chronology of some early Siddhas. B.N. Chaudhuri's *Buddhist Centres in Ancient India* (1969) dealt with the geographical distribution of early Buddhism mainly on the basis of the Pali sources; epigraphical materials were also successfully used in this volume. A.K. Warder's *Indian Buddhism* (1970) was a very extensive and documented historical sketch in twelve chapters dealing respectively with Indian civilisation before the Buddha; India in the time of the Buddha; the life of the Buddha; the doctrine of the Buddha; causation; Buddhism and society; collecting the Tripiṭaka; the polarisation of Buddhism; the eighteen schools; Mahāyāna and Mādhyamaka; idealism and the theory of knowledge; and the great universities and the Mantrayāna. The introductory portion dealt with the sources of our knowledge of Buddhism and also the methodology adopted. Warder's final conclusion is worth-quoting: "Here we have attempted to ascertain what Buddhism is, doctrinally, as defined in its texts, thus to establish facts about it as a prerequisite to evaluation or application. In particular we have attempted to discover what Buddhism was, in the stricter sense of the teaching of the Buddha *c.* 500 BC, and to place other kinds of Indian 'Buddhism' in relation to that. If the reader should feel that this book is most incomplete, even as regards the Doctrine, the author will at least have succeeded in suggesting that Buddhism, still more all the 'Buddhism', is not simple. At the same time he hopes to have shown that its principles are not vague or mysterious. He has picked up a handful of points from the earliest Tripiṭaka now accessible to us, following the evidence as to what is most essential. These are drops from an ocean, but from an ocean which, we are told, has a single taste—that of freedom". Hajima Nakamura's *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes* (1987) was an important recent contribution to the historical studies on Buddhism.

Studies in the field of the regional histories of Buddhism were inspired from the archaeological discoveries connected with the sites of Buddhism in different parts of India. History of Buddhism in Bengal had always been a favourite topic of the scholars because the last phase of Buddhism in India was arranged with Bengal.[145]

[145]R.C. Majumdar, *History of Bengal*, I, Dacca, 1943; N.N.Dasgupta,*Bāṅglāy Bauddhadharma* (in Bengali, 1947); T.O. Ling, 'Buddhism in Bengal' in *Man and His*

This phase was worked out by R.C. Mitra in his *Decline of Buddhism in India* (1955) in which the author had done his best from the available Buddhist and other materials. But the subject required a new appraisal since Buddhism was characterised by a series of metamorphosis which eventually led it beyond recognition. As early as in 1911, N.N. Vasu wrote on the surviving Buddhism in Orissa under the title *Modern Buddhism and Its Followers in Orissa*. It contained a valuable introduction written by Haraprasad Sastri. It was subsequently translated into Hindi by N. Caturvedi in 1961. Among other works mention should be made of N.K. Sahu's *Buddhism in Orissa* (1958) and Prabhat Mukherjee's *Buddhist Remains in Orissa* (1961). Debala Mitra's Excavations at Ratnagiri, the discovery of Banpur hoard and such other events have recently created much interest for a renovated study of Buddhism in Orissa. In 1914 L.W. Shakespear in his *History of Upper Assam* had pointed out that the faith prevailed in the land from a very ancient period and that many Hindu temples might have been built on the old Buddhist sites. In 1950, B.K. Barua published 'Notices of Buddhism in Assam,' in *D.V. Potdar Commemoration Volume*, but in his *Cultural History of Assam* (1951) he said that Buddhism had nothing to do with that country. However, some light on Buddhism in Assam was thrown on the basis of painstaking researches by P.C. Chaudhuri in his *History of Civilization of the People of Assam* (1966). Recently S. Sasanananda published *Buddhism in Assam* (1983) in which he tried to show, not quite successfully, that Buddhism came to Assam from her eastern and north-eastern neighbouring countries. P.C. Alexander's *Buddhism in Kerala* (1949) and A. Aiyappan and P.R. Srinivasan's *The Story of Buddhism with special reference to South India* (1960) were useful works on southern Buddhism. Some important works were done on Buddhism in Kashmir and Ladakh.[146] Among other regional histories, N. Dutt and K.D. Bajpai's *Development of Buddhism in Uttar Pradesh* (1956), Upendra Thakur's *Studies in Jainism and Buddhism in Mithila* (1964), D.C. Ahir's *Buddhism in*

Salvation: Studies in the Memory of S.G.F. Brandon, Manchester Univ., 1973, 171–87; Sukomal Chaudhuri, *Bañglādeśe Bauddhadharma* (in Bengali, 1974); Gayatri Sen Majumdar, *Buddhism in Ancient Bengal*, Calcutta, 1983.

[146]G.N. and P.N. Ganhar, *Buddhism in Kasmir and Ladakh*, 1956; Jan Yun Hua, 'Kashmir's Contribution to the Expansion of Buddhism in the Far East' in *IHQ*, XXXVII, 1961; J. Nandon, *Les Bouddhistes Kashmiriens*, 1961; Sarla Khosla's *History of Buddhism in Kashmir*, 1972; F.M. Hassnain, *Buddhist Kashmir*, 1973; D.N. Snellgrove and T. Skorupski ed., *The Cultural Heritage of Ladakh*, 1977.

Northern India (1972), S.M. Pahadia's *Buddhism in Malwa* (1976), B.G. Gokhale's *Buddhism in Maharashtra* (1976) etc. were important.

Study in Buddhist sites and monuments, which formed the substratum of the researches in regional histories of Buddhism in India, derived its main impulses from the labour of Sir Alexander Cunningham and James Burgess. The Central Indian Buddhist sites, mainly those of Sanchi, Bharhut, Bagh, Sirpur and Dhamnar had attracted a host of scholars.[147] The Buddhist sites of western India, especially the cave temples of the Maharashtra region such as the well known sites of Bhaja, Bedsa, Karle, Junnar, Kondane, Kondivte, Kanheri, Nasik, Pitalkhora, Ajanta, Aurangabad, Ellora, Sopara, etc., were also subjected to intensive study and research.[148] Among the important Buddhist sites of northwestern India reference should be made to Shah-ji-ki-dheri, Peshawar, Takht-i-Bahi, Sahribahlol, Jamalgarhi, Taxila, Manikyala, etc. A few sites of Sind like Mirpur-Khas, Saidpur, etc. should also be mentioned. As early as in 1879 W. Simson made a general observation on the Buddhist architecture of Jalalabad and the Buddhist caves of Afghanistan. In 1883 H.H. Cole submitted a memorandum on the ancient monuments in Eusufzazi. In 1886 M.G. Talbot wrote on the rock-caves and statues at Bamian. Systematic exploration and excavation in these regions began to take place from the beginning of the twentieth century by Sir Aurel Stein, D.B. Spooner, J. Marshall, J.Ph. Vogel, H. Cousens, D.R. Bhandarkar, N.G. Majumdar, R.D. Banerji, A.H. Dani and

[147]Cunningham, *Bhilsa Topes*, 1854; *The Stūpa of Bharhut*, 1879; F.C. Maisey, *Sanchi and Its Remains*, 1894; H. Cousens, 'Dhamnar' in *ASIAR* for 1905–06, 107–15; A.K. Haldar, 'Bagh' in *Burlington Magazine*, 1911; J. Marshall, 'Sanchi' in *ASIAR* for 1913–14, 1 ff.; *A Guide to Sanchi* (1918); R.P.Chanda, 'Sanchi' in *MASI*, I, 1919; Marshall, Gadre, Vogel, Havell and Cousens, *The Bagh Caves*, 1927; Marshall, Foucher and Majumdar, *The Monuments of Sanchi*, 1940; M. Hamid, *Excavation at Sanchi*, 1940; B.M. Barua, *Bharhut*, 1934, 1937; S.C. Kala, *Bharhut Vedika*, 1951; etc.

[148]Burgess, 'Notes on the Rock-temples of Ajanta' in *ASWI*, IX, 1879; *Report on Bidar and Aurangabad*, 1878; *Report on Ellora*, 1883; B.L. Indraji, *Sopara and Padana*, 1883; J. Griffith, *Paintings in the Buddhist Cave Temples of Ajanta*, 1896; M.C. Dey, *My Pilgrimage to Ajanta and Bagh*, 1927; R.S. Wanchipe, *Buddhist Cave Temples of India*, 1983; G. Yazdani, *Ajanta*, 1930–55; 'Rock-hewn Temples of Aurangabad' in *Indian Arts and Letters*, XI, 1937; D. Barrett, *Guide to Buddhist Caves of Aurangabad and Guide to the Karla Caves*, 1957; R. Sengupta, *Guide to the Buddhist Caves of Elura*, 1958; M.N. Despande, 'Pitalkhora' in *Ancient India*, XV, 1958, 66–92; R.S. Gupte and B.D. Mahajan, *Ajanta, Ellora and Aurangabad Caves*, 1962; A. Ghosh et al., *Ajanta Murals*, 1967; etc.

others.[149] James Burgess's *Report on the Antiquities of Kathiawar and Kutch* was published in 1876. The Buddhist sites of Gujarat and the sphere of Buddhist influence on this region had previously been described by A.S. Gadre and M.G. Dikshit. Excavations at Devnimori and Amreli had also yeilded tangible result.[150] In Rajasthan, Buddhist remains at Shergarh in the Kota district, Bairat in Jaipur district, Binnayaga and Hathiager in Jhalawar district had been studied.[151] Kashmirian sites had been mentioned by R.C. Kak.[152] So far as the southern Buddhist sites are concerned, Amaravati was studied by Fergusson (1868), Burgess (1882), Sewell (1887), Rea (1905); Jaggayyapeta by Burgess (1887) and Debala Mitra (1959); Guntupalle by Sewell (1887); Bhattiprolu, Gudivara, Ghantasala, Sankaram hills and Ramatirtham by Rea (1905–12); Kanchipuram by Gopinath Rao (1915); Salihundam by Longhurst (1918–20), Marshall (1922, also Ghantasala) and Subrahmanyam (1964); and Nagarjunikonda by Kuraishi (1926–27), Longhurst (1927–30, 1938), Fabri (1930–34), H. Sarkar and B.N. Misra (1960, 1964).[153]

As early as in 1872 A.M. Broadly wrote a monograph under the title *Ruins of the Nalanda Monasteries at Bargaon*. The site was subsequently excavated and the reports were published by D.B. Spooner (1915–18), J.A. Page (1922–29), M.H. Kuraishi and G.C. Chandra (1929–35) and M. Nazim (1936–37) in the *Annual Reports of the ASI*. Cunningham's famous work on Bodhgaya under the title *Mahabodhi* was published in 1878 which was followed by R.L. Mitra's *Bodhgaya* (1882). Report of T. Bloch's explorations in Bodhgaya was published in *ASIAR* for 1908–09. V.A. Smith and W.C. Peppe wrote on the Stūpa of Piprahwa (1898), the suggested

[149]See *ASIAR*, 1902–03 to1919–20; *Progress Report of the ASI, Western Circles*, 1917; J. Marshall, *Guide to Taxila*, 1936; *Taxila*, 1951; *Ancient Pakistan*, II, 1965–66, 17 ff.

[150]*Jour. Gujarat Res. Soc.*, I, 1939, 61 ff.; VIII, 1946, 1 ff.; S.N. Chowdhury, *Excavations at Devnimori*, 1966; S.R. Rao, *Excavations at Amreli*, 1966.

[151]*Ind. Ant.*, 1885; *Progress Rep. ASI* (Wc), 1904; *ASIAR* for1935–36; D.R.Sahni, *Archaeological Remains and Excavations in Bairat*, 1937; R.C. Agarwala in *Lalit Kala*, XI, 1962, 60 ff.

[152]*Ancient Monuments of Kashmir*, London, 1933.

[153]See *JRAS*, III, 1868; XIX, 1887; *Ind. Ant.*, XLIV, 1915, 127 ff.; *ASIAR*, 1905–06 to 1910–11; 1927–28 to 1930–34; *ASI, Southern Circle*, 1918–20; *Annual Rep. of the DG, ASI*, 1922, 28 ff.; *MASI*, 54, 1938; *IHQ*, XXXV, 1959, 274 ff.; K.R. Subramanian, *Buddhist Remains in Andhra*, Madras, 1932; R. Subrahmanyam, *Salihundum: A Buddhist Site in Andhra Pradesh*, Hyderabad,1964; T.N. Ramachandran, *Nagarjunikonda*, MASI, LXXI; H. Sarkar and B.N. Misra, *Nagarjunikonda*, New Delhi, 1966.

site of the Buddha's Kapilavāstu.[154] Reports of excavations at Pāṭaliputra were published by Waddell (1903) and Spooner (1912–13); Kasia by Vogel (1904-07) and H. Sastri (1911–12); Sarnath by F.O. Oertel (1904–05), Marshall and Sten Konow (1906–08), Hargreaves (1914–15), D.R. Sahni (1921–22) and R.P. Chanda (1927–28); Rajgir by Marshall and Bloch (1905–06), Jackson (1913–14) and M. Nazim (1936–37); Sahet Mahet by Vogel (1907–08) and Marshall (1910–11); Lauriya by Marshall (1904–05), Bloch (1905–07) and N.G. Majumdar (1936–37); Basarh by Spooner (1911–14); and Bhita by Marshall (1911–12)—all in the *Annual Reports of the ASI*. Recent excavations at Antichak in the Bhagalpur district has brought to light the ancient site of the Vikramaśīlā Mahāvihāra. R.L. Mitra's *Antiquities of Orissa* came out in 1875 and N.N. Vasu's *Archaeological Survey of Mayurbhanj* in 1911. The results of the explorations in Mayurbhanj and Khiching by R.P. Chanda were published in the *ASIAR*, 1922–24. The Ratnagiri Mahāvihāra was excavated by Debala Mitra and its result was published in 1960. In Bengal, the site of Paharpur was explored and excavated by D.R. Bhandarkar, J.N. Banerjea and H.C. Ray (*ASIAR*, 1922–23), R.D. Banerji (ibid., 1925–26), K.N. Dikshit (ibid., 1926–29) and G.C. Chandra (ibid., 1930–34); Mainamati by D.C. Bhattacharya (1944), T.N. Ramachandran (1946), and F.A. Khan (1955–57). N. Ahmed's *Mahasthan* was published in 1964 and S.R. Das's Rajbadidanga in 1968.[155] Debala Mitra's *Buddhist Monuments* (1971) presented an up-to-date and comprehensive account of the Buddhist monument scattered all over India.

From the very beginning of the researches on Buddhism the emphasis was on the doctrinal aspects. Buddhism was viewed by almost

[154]Previously Lassen, Cunningham and Carlyle identified Kapilavāstu with some sites in the districts of Gorakhpur and Basti. Subsequently with the discovery of two fragments of an inscribed pillar near Taulihawa in Nepalese Tarai, the lower portion of an Aśokan pillar and a Stūpa at nearby Gotihawa, a pillar with the record of Aśoka at Lumbini and a Stūpa with precious deposits at Piprahwa, the question of the identification of Kapilavāstu was viewed in a positive angle. In 1897, A. Führer attributed an extensive region comprising the aforesaid and adjoining sites to Kapilavāstu. In 1901, P.C. Mukherji declared Tilaurakot (modern township of Taulihawa) as Kapilavāstu. T.W. Rhys Davids took Tilaura-kot and Piprahwa to be the old and new cities of Kapilavāstu. Subsequent discoveries and circumstantial evidences show that Piprahwa has a more reasonable claim for being the original site of Kapilavāstu or a part of it.

[155]D.C. Bhattacharyya in *IHQ*, XX.1–8; K.N. Dikshit, *Excavations at Paharpur*, MASI, LVI, 1938; T.N. Ramachandran in *B.C. Law Volume*, II, 1946, 213–31.

all the scholars as the way out of an individual's spiritual, mental and moral crisis, and this approach still predominates. The recent trend is to find in Buddhism an art or technique of realising mystic experience. The social basis of ideas was never seriously taken into consideration especially in regard to Buddhism. That the rise of Buddhism was certainly to serve some social purpose and that it had some distinct social and functional role was first stressed by C.F. Köppen in his *Die Religion des Buddha* (2 vols., 1857–59) and *Die lamaische Hierarchie and Kirche* (1859). Oldenberg in his *Buddha* (1881) tried to provide a socio-economic base of Buddhism with a funny theory: The Aryans of northwestern India were stout and strong because they took milk and flesh and stayed in a nice climate. With their subsequent migration to eastern India, the climate did not suit them. They became lean and thin and victim of numerous tropical diseases. The rate of their mortality increased to such a fantastic level that they became disinterested in life. To them life meant nothing but disease, infirmity and death, and all these were the material basis of the Buddha's teachings. The reality of disease, infirmity and death made them unworldly and they resorted to the illusion of the other world, to the ideas of rebirth, transmigration and metempsychosis, which were all supplied by the Buddha as the way out of the miseries of human existence. If not the same, a similar view was upheld by Kern also. T.W. Rhys Davids was, however, on a more solid ground. Instead of making subjective speculations he insisted on the objective conditions in relation to society, politics and other aspects of life as might be found from the Pali sources, which according to him were full of informations.

Among the works dealing with the functional aspects of Buddhism, R.C. Majumdar's *Corporate Life in Ancient India* (1916) threw some significant light on the constitution of the Buddhist Saṅghas and the essential features of the Buddhist monastic life. The Saṅghas were run strictly on the basis of democratic rules. Even a scholar like Majumdar (and also Rhys Davids, Oldenberg and Jayaswal) thought it necessary to use the term 'communistic' to denote the functioning of the early Buddhist Saṅghas. All decisions were to be unanimous, and if that was not possible the verdict of the majority was to be granted. There was no such thing as private property within the Saṅgha. The monks could use only three cloth garments, preferably stitched from rags, an almsbowl, needle and thread, and a razor, but these were not personal possessions. They

were forbidden ownership of houses, fields, cattle, the touch of gold or silver and trade. They lived on alms which amounted to one doubtful meal a day. Wherefrom did the Buddha imitate such a model? G.D. De in his *Democracy in Early Buddhist Saṅgha* (1955) suggested a tribal model not only for the understanding of the functioning of the early Buddhist Saṅghas but for that of certain ideals which characterised the ancient Indian society as a whole. Debiprasad (*Lokāyata*, 1959) from a Marxist point of view held that the Buddha was overwhelmed by the stupendous social transformation, the rise of class society and state power, and asked the people to join his Saṅghas which were modelled on the patterns of tribal democracies and meant to be the ideal substitutes for a vanished way of life. He took great care to see that the members therein lived a perfectly detached life, i.e. datached from the great historical transformation going on in the society at large. At the same time the Buddha had to face the dual requirements of his age: On the one hand he tried to boost up some of the progressive features of the emergent state power and mercantile system and on the other to revive some of the beneficial aspects of tribal life symbolised by the Saṅgha in the newly evolved more ruthless form of class society. There was obviously a marked difference between the incipient forms and subsequent highly institutionalised forms of the Buddhist Saṅghas. The latter aspect was elaborately dealt with in Sukumar Dutt's *Buddhist Monks and Monasteries* (1963) and D.K. Barua's *Viharas in Ancient India: A Survey of Buddhist Monasteries* (1969).

Among the works on socio-economic aspects, R.Fick's *Die sociale Gliederung in nordöstlichen Indien zu Buddha's Zeit* (1897) was a storehouse of socio-economic data collected mainly from the Jātakas. It was translated into English in 1920 by S.K. Mitra under the title *Social Organisation of Northeast India in Buddha's Time*. Mrs C.A.F. Rhys Davids made some economic studies from the Buddhist sources in *Economic Journal* (1910), *JRAS* (1910), and *Cambridge History of India*, vol.I (1922) in which she dealt with the rural economy, cities and villages, land system, agriculture, labour and industry, social conditions, trade and commerce, trade centres and routes, methods of exchange and prices, security and interest and made a general conclusion of what transpired from the sources she studied. U. Dharmaratna's *The Buddha and the Caste System* (1955) emphasised the Buddha's progressive outlook in regard to the caste system. Although theoretically Buddhism was opposed to the caste

system, and within the Saṅgha its practice was not allowed, still Buddhism as a social force failed to abolish this system for well known historical reasons. But outside India, where the Indian form of caste system did not develop, Buddhism appeared as a civilising influence, although it was the mainstay of feudalism in the lands where it spread. In some countries (Srilanka and especially Tibet) this feudalism was ecclesiastical in which church and state became practically identical, while in China Buddhism helped to bring an administrative structure headed by the emperor and run by a host of feudal lords. The role of Buddhism in relation to caste, race and other social and political questions varied from one place to another.

Among the Marxist writers, D.D. Kosambi (1956, 1965) held that the Vaiśyas and the Śūdras had the task of producing the surplus which the priests and the warriors took away by natural right, originally for the good of tribes, but soon for the good of the upper castes. Unlike the Vedic pastoral society, in the time of the Buddha had gone over to agriculture so that the slaughter of more and more animals at a growing number of sacrifice meant a much heavier drain upon producer and production, telling upon the trading class and new economic set up. Herein lay the economic reason on the Buddhist emphasis on *ahiṃsā*. Truth, justice not encroaching upon the possession of others, and similar values showed that a totally new concept of private individual property had arisen. The doctrine of *karma* was a religious extension of the elementary concept of agricultural economy. It could grow and ripen like a seed planted in previous season, or mature like a debt, while it never failed to pay in exact proportion. Buddhism did not fight to abolish all castes from the society, even though the Śramaṇa himself renounced caste. Though the Buddhist monastic order functioned along the lines of a tribal *sabhā* council, the Buddhist precepts were meant for a class society far beyond the tribe, caste or cult. Narendra Wagle in his *Society at the Time of Buddha* (1968) followed a new methodology to analyse the social structure of an earlier age from the Pali works of a relatively late period. He appeared to have adopted, with certain reservations, Morgan's theory of consanguinity and affinity which could throw light on the obscure of social life on the basis of the studies in the evolution of kinship terms. Morgan's theory was modified and applied to the problems of the origins of the social institutions by Robert Briffault. It also helped

George Thomson to uncover many forgotten pages of the Greek social history. Wagle in this book under review had analysed the terms of address used by different members of society and thus outlined social groupings and rankings. On the basis of certain terms of habitation, such as *gāma, nigama*, etc. he had tried to explain the patterns of settlements and their relative significance. He had also thrown light on the pattern of economic life of the period. Besides an introduction the work contained chapters on patterns of settlement social groups and rankings, kinship and marriage and occupational divisions and also a few appendices.

Since 1970, R.S. Sharma in a number of his articles and lectures tried to throw light on the material milieu of the origins of Buddhism. He held that the primary factor that revolutionised the material life of the people around 700 BC in eastern U.P. and Bihar, the birth-place of Buddhism was the use of iron which initiated plough agriculture with iron ploughshare, and consequently created a new social set up, a class society marked by the rise of state power, in which cattle in the form of private wealth, to be increased by commercial activities, gained much importance and its senseless destruction for the purpose of non-vegetarian food and Brahamanical sacrificial cults came to be discouraged. The voice of protest was raised by the trading class and was given theoretical and moral support by the Buddha and his contemporaries. A considerable part of D.K. Barua's *Analytical Study of the Nikāyas* (1972) and G.S.P Misra's *The Age of Vinaya* (1972) also contained valuable informations on socio-economic infrastructure of early Buddhism. V.P. Varma's *Early Buddhism and Its Origins* (1973) dealt with Buddhism and social sciences, in which special emphasis was laid upon the economic background of Buddhism, its political, social, anthropological and philosophical foundations. It also contained a number of appendices under the titles 'Nihilism', 'Aśoka and Buddhism', 'Buddha and Aurobindo', 'Buddha and Marx', 'Narendra Dev's interpretation of Buddhism', etc. Uma Chakravarti's *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism* (1987) made a historical investigation into the relationship between early Buddhism and the society in which it was located. It analysed the social and economic categories of society at the time of the Buddha and contributed to an understanding of the category of Gahapati which appeared prominently in early Buddhist literature which also featured in the earliest inscriptional evidence, but had so far eluded rigorous analysis.

Cakravarti's work also examined the principles on which the Buddhist system of stratification was based and investigated the social origins of the two major components of early Buddhism, the Bhikkhus and the Upāsakas. It further analysed the role of power and the conceptualisation of ideal socio-political system as envisaged in Buddhism.

A complete history of Buddhism in Srilanka was outlined in 1928 by G.P. Malalasekera in his treatment of the history of Pali literature in Ceylon, and his celebrated *Dictionary* contained textual references of persons and places of Srilanka associated with Buddhism. The learned articles dealing with different aspects of Ceylonese Buddhism by Jayavikrama, Wijisekera, Charles Godage, etc., and also the activities of the Archaeological Survey of Ceylon contributed immensely to the reconstruction of the history of Ceylonese Buddhism. Adikaram's *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (1946) and W. Rahula's *History of Buddhism in Ceylon: The Anuradhapur Period* (1956) dealt with the missionaries sent by the Emperor Aśoka, the tradition of the transplantation of the Bodhi tree and the bringing of the Buddha's tooth from India, the events during the region of the Buddhist kings like Duṭṭagamini, Vaṭṭagamini, and others, the schools of Abhayagiri, Dakkhinavihāra and Jetavana, the serious splits in the Buddhism in Srilanka. The latter work especially dealt with the period from the third century B.C. to tenth century A.D. For recent developments in Ceylonese Buddhism in terms of modern problems of life the chapter entitled 'Religious Revival and Cultural Nationalism,' in W.H. Wrigging's *Ceylon: Dilemmas of a New Nation* (1960) was significant. An important study of religion and society in Srilanka was H. Bechart's *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Landem des Theravāda Buddhismus* (1966). Niharranjan Ray's *Theravāda Buddhism in Burma* was published in 1946. Among subsequent important publications mention should be made of E. Sarkisyanz's *Buddhist Background of Burmese Revolution* (1965), D.E. Smith's *Religion and Politics in Burma* (1965) and M.E. Spiro's *Buddhism and Society: A Great Tradition and Its Burmese Vicissitudes* (1970). The second revised and enlarged edition of Kenneth E. Well's *Thai Buddhism: Its Rites and Activities* came out in 1960. In 1966 Sukumar Dutt published an important work under the title *Buddhism in South-East Asia*, the first part of which dealt with, besides the introduction and the traditional nine missions sent from India, the history of Buddhism in Srilanka, the second part with Buddhism in Burma, Siam (including Laos) Cambodia and Vietnam, the third with Buddhism in China, the Chinese Turkestan and the Oasis states and the fourth with Buddhism in Japan and Tibet. The English translation of G. Coedes's remarkable French work under the titles *The Making of South-East Asia* and *The Indianised States of South-East Asia* came out in 1967 and 1968 respectively. Both these works discussed the impact of Indian civilisation and of Buddhism in this area of the Asian continent.

E.O. Reischaur's *Enin's Diary: The Record of a Pilgrimage to China in Search of Law* (1955) was a significant contribution for an historical understanding of the influence of Chinese Buddhism on Japan. For the study of Zen Buddhism, D.T. Suzuki's *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (new ed. in three series 1927–61), H. Dumoulin's *Zen: Geschichte und Gestalt* (1959, Eng. Trans., *A History of Zen Buddhism*, (1963) and *The Development of Chinese Zen after Sixth Patriarch in the Light of Mumonkan* (Original German, and Eng. trans., (1953) were important, besides Z. Tsuji's *History of Japanese Buddhism* in ten volumes which was a remarkable contribution throwing new light on the Tendai, Shingon, Zen, Pureland and Nichiren groups. Among the recent publications mention should be made of S. Sunim's *Korean Zen: Tradition and Teachers* (1987). For a general survey of Chinese Buddhism, E. Zürcher's *Buddhist Conquest of China* (1959), A.F. Wright's *Buddhism and Chinese History* (1959) and K.S. Ch'en's *Buddhism in China* (1964) were specially important. On contemporary Buddhist Monasticism in China mention should be made of W. Welch's *The Practice of Chinese Buddhism, 1900–50* (1967). In 1963 a good study on Hiuen Tsang was published by the Vietnam Buddhist Institute. It was written by Thich Minha Chau. We have some valuable books on Chinese Buddhism written by the Chinese scholars of India. We have already had the occasion to refer to W. Pa-Chow's *Comparative Study of the Prātimokṣa* (1955). Reference must be made in this connection to C.H. Kuang's *History of Chinese Buddhism* (1956) in which work, besides the general history of Chinese Buddhism, special emphasis was laid upon the Sino-Indian relation since the introduction of Buddhism in China. The book also contained a valuable appendix on the life of Hiuen Tsang. In 1966 Jan Yun Hua's *Chronicle of Buddhism in China* was published by the Visvabharati University. It contained an account of Chinese Buddhism during the period AD 581–960. It was in fact a rendering from the monk Chip-P'an's *Fo-tsu-tung-chi*, edited, translated and annotated with an in-

troduction. A.C. Banerjee's *Studies in Chinese Buddhism* (1977) was also an important addition. Among the recent studies, Latika Lahiri's *Chinese Monks in India* (1986) was an authoritative contribution in which Chinese sources were used in original. R. Ram's *History of Buddhism in Nepal* came out in 1978. Divided into ten chapters the book began with an introduction about the historiography of Nepalese Buddhist studies. The religious and spiritual pursuits of the Nepalese kings and Indian Buddhist monks, the role of the Siddhas, the influence of Gorakhnāth, facts about Atīśa, Dharmasvāmin's account of Nepalese Buddhism, travel hazards experienced by the Tibetan Buddhist monks, wars and calamities, conflict between the Brāhmaṇa and Buddhist ideological forces, etc. were vividly dealt with in this work. Rick Field's *How the Swans Came to the Lake* (1986) was a narrative history of Buddhism in America telling how the grounds of its arrival was prepared by the intellectuals and the Chinese and Japanese immigrants, how in the wake of the World Parliament of Religions in 1893 Buddhism was popularised in America by Soyen Shaku, D.T. Suzuki, Nyogen Senzaki and others and how the present-day centres of Zen, Theravādin and Tibetan Buddhism were established. B.N. Puri's *Buddhism in Central Asia* (1987) described how the people of the vast region between the Tien-shan and the Kunlun ranges, belonging to the different races and professions and speaking in different languages, were finally blended into a cosmopolitan culture by means of Buddhism.

Recent studies are mostly associated with Tibetan Buddhism. Some well known previous works in this field—not hitherto mentioned in the present chapter—were H. Hoffmann's *Die Religionen Tibets* (1956, Eng. trans., *The Religion of Tibet*, 1961), R.J. Miller's *Monasteries and Culture Change in Inner Mongolia* (1959), G. Tucci and W. Hessig's *Die Religion in Tibets und der Mongolia* (1970), and R.A. Stein's *Le Civilization Tibetaine* (1962, Eng. trans., *Tibetan Civilization*, 1972). Tibetan sources contain numerous historical biographies of eminent Buddhist saints. Among the earlier studies on the biographies mention may be made of G. Roerich's *Biography of Dharmasvāmin* (1950) and H.V. Guenther's *Life and Teachings of Naropā* (1963). Alaka Chattopadhyaya's *Atiśa and Tibet* (1967) embodied an enormous amount of research material compiled from original Tibetan sources. Specially important were the appendices containing new Tibetan sources translated into English. Certain

special features of this work were the mathematical calculations concerning the Tibetan sexagenary cycle invaluable for any Tibetologist. Dīpaṃkara's *Route to Tibet*, and the Sanskrit restoration of *Bodhipathapradīpa*. Eva Dargyay's *The Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet* (1978) analysed the tradition of the Old School of Tibetan Buddhism. More than twenty biographies, unveiling many previously unknown facts and events were also dealt with in this volume. Lobsang P. Lhalungpa's *The Life of Milarepa* (1986) was the illustrated biography of the eleventh-century mystic and poet. Chogyam Trungpa's the *Life of Marpa: The Translator* (1986) was also a similar work based on the life of Marpa, a disciple of Naropā, who endured many hardships in his quest of true knowledge. Marpa succeeded in mastering the Tantric teachings, translating and bringing them to Tibet and establishing the Practice Lineage of the Kagyus, which continues to this day. David Snellgrove's *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and their Tibetan Successors* (1987) provided a comprehensive survey of Indian Buddhism and its subsequent establishment in Tibet concentrating on the Tantric period of Buddhist theory and practice, from the eighth to thirteenth century. The author emphasised the significant role played by the Central Asian kingdoms along the ancient silk route in the gradual process of Tibetan conversion. Throughout Snellgrove quoted extensively from numerous original sources, many of which had never before been translated into English. He drew convincingly upon documents of the time to illustrate the cultural changes that swept Tibet as a result of its rule over an extensive Central Asian empire from the seventh to the ninth century. The illustrations contained in the second volumes included photographs of iconographical art as well as points of historical interest.

Among the more recent works studies in philosophical aspects have received greater prominence. The Danish scholar Chr. Lindtner has a number of important publications from Copenhagen. Foremost among these is *To Buddhistiske Laererigte* (1981) which is the Danish translation of Nāgārjuna's *Suhṛllekha* and Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* with introduction and notes. The second *Nāgārjunas Filosofiske Vacrker* (1982) contains Danish translation of Nāgārjuna's *Bodhicittavaraṇa*, *Catuḥstava*, *Mūlamadhyamakārikā*, *Sūnyatāsaptativṛtti* and *Vigrahavyavartani*. The third *Miscellanea Buddhica* (1985) is a collection of four articles: J.W. de Jong's 'Le Grande Vyuha et ha loi de la naissance et de la mort'; David Eckel's

'Bhāvaviveka's Critique of Yogācāra Philosophy' ; V.V. Gokhale and S.S. Bahulkar's English translation of the first chapter of Bhavya's Tarkajvāla; and Chr. Lindtner's 'A Treatise on Buddhist Idealism'. The fourth is *Nāgārjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna* (1987) in which the author deals with the thirteen genuine works of Nāgārjuna. Karen Lang's *Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka* (1986) is also published from Copenhagen. Donald S. Lopez's *A Study of Svatantrika* (1987) represents an important contribution to the understanding of Mādhyamika philosophy which had two subschools, Prāsaṅgika and Svatantrika. The former school of Candrakīrti is better known than the latter, because the major Svatantrika texts are preserved only in Tibetan translation. The synthesis of Yogācāra and Mādhyamika philosophy by the Svatantrika master Śāntarakṣita represents the final development of Buddhist thought in India. In Tibet Svatantrika was the first Indian Buddhist school to gain currency prior to the translation of the works of Candrakīrti into Tibetan. G.C. Nayak's *Philosophical Reflections* (1987) presents a lively discussion of philosophical topics of Indian origin. The intricacies of the Buddhist Mādhyamika school and Hindu Advaita Vedānta are discussed. A critical and intelligent evaluation of their diverse strands form the special note of the exposition. Gregory J. Darling's *An Evaluation of the Vedantic Critique of Buddhism* (1987) represents a comparison of the critique of Buddhism as set forth in the interpretations of Śaṅkara, Madhva and Rāmānuja to the *sūtras* of the second section of the *Brahmasūtras* concerned with the refutation of Buddhism, with the positions actually elaborated by the Buddhists in their own texts. An attempt is made to compare the conflicting interpretations of the three commentators to these particular *sūtras* in accordance with the philosophical approach unique to each commentator. The first part of this work contains an introductory background including a brief description of the *Brahmasūtras*. The second part proceeds *sūtra* by *sūtra* to study the three commentators' interpretations of the particular *sūtras* against the Buddhists. Frank J. Hoffman's *Rationality and Mind in Early Buddhism* (1987) is based on Pali Nikāyas. Although the approach taken involves distinguishing between what can be said within the context of the Buddhist texts themselves from what can be said from the point of view of contemporary philosophy of religion, whenever practicable insights from the philosophy of religion are employed to elucidate the texts, without any

overall subjective imposition. Combined with the suggestivity of the Pali texts, the approach which emerges is both contextual and critical. R.S. Bucknell and Martin Stuart-Fox's *The Twilight Language* (1987) is an investigation into the nature of the Buddha's enlightenment and the meaning of Buddhist symbolism. The authors hold that these two are in fact connected because both are ultimately concerned with meditative practices. They examine the relationship that appears to exist between Buddhist meditative techniques and certain examples of Buddhist symbolism as found in the earliest Pali texts and in the so called Twilight language of the Tantras. In doing so, the authors bring together two approaches to Buddhist hermeneutics which in the past have never been properly integrated: the meditative-descriptive approach and the scholarly historical approach. The work reflects an interpretation of the Buddhist path to enlightenment and throws light on some key aspects of Buddhist cosmology and doctrine.

'Bhāvaviveka's Critique of Yogācāra Philosophy' ; V.V. Gokhale and S.S. Bahulkar's English translation of the first chapter of Bhavya's Tarkajvāla; and Chr. Lindtner's 'A Treatise on Buddhist Idealism'. The fourth is *Nāgārjuniana: Studies in the Writings and Philosophy of Nāgārjuna* (1987) in which the author deals with the thirteen genuine works of Nāgārjuna. Karen Lang's *Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka* (1986) is also published from Copenhagen. Donald S. Lopez's *A Study of Svatantrika* (1987) represents an important contribution to the understanding of Mādhyamika philosophy which had two subschools, Prāsaṅgika and Svatantrika. The former school of Candrakīrti is better known than the latter, because the major Svatantrika texts are preserved only in Tibetan translation. The synthesis of Yogācāra and Mādhyamika philosophy by the Svatantrika master Śāntarakṣita represents the final development of Buddhist thought in India. In Tibet Svatantrika was the first Indian Buddhist school to gain currency prior to the translation of the works of Candrakīrti into Tibetan. G.C. Nayak's *Philosophical Reflections* (1987) presents a lively discussion of philosophical topics of Indian origin. The intricacies of the Buddhist Mādhyamika school and Hindu Advaita Vedānta are discussed. A critical and intelligent evaluation of their diverse strands form the special note of the exposition. Gregory J. Darling's *An Evaluation of the Vedantic Critique of Buddhism* (1987) represents a comparison of the critique of Buddhism as set forth in the interpretations of Śaṅkara, Madhva and Rāmānuja to the *sūtras* of the second section of the *Brahmasūtras* concerned with the refutation of Buddhism, with the positions actually elaborated by the Buddhists in their own texts. An attempt is made to compare the conflicting interpretations of the three commentators to these particular *sūtras* in accordance with the philosophical approach unique to each commentator. The first part of this work contains an introductory background including a brief description of the *Brahmasūtras*. The second part proceeds *sūtra* by *sūtra* to study the three commentators' interpretations of the particular *sūtras* against the Buddhists. Frank J. Hoffman's *Rationality and Mind in Early Buddhism* (1987) is based on Pali Nikāyas. Although the approach taken involves distinguishing between what can be said within the context of the Buddhist texts themselves from what can be said from the point of view of contemporary philosophy of religion, whenever practicable insights from the philosophy of religion are employed to elucidate the texts, without any

overall subjective imposition. Combined with the suggestivity of the Pali texts, the approach which emerges is both contextual and critical. R.S. Bucknell and Martin Stuart-Fox's *The Twilight Language* (1987) is an investigation into the nature of the Buddha's enlightenment and the meaning of Buddhist symbolism. The authors hold that these two are in fact connected because both are ultimately concerned with meditative practices. They examine the relationship that appears to exist between Buddhist meditative techniques and certain examples of Buddhist symbolism as found in the earliest Pali texts and in the so called Twilight language of the Tantras. In doing so, the authors bring together two approaches to Buddhist hermeneutics which in the past have never been properly integrated: the meditative-descriptive approach and the scholarly historical approach. The work reflects an interpretation of the Buddhist path to enlightenment and throws light on some key aspects of Buddhist cosmology and doctrine.

CHAPTER 4

Studies on Jainism

In the beginning of the present century the French orientalist A. Guerinot undertook the first systematic survey of all the available printed books and articles on Jainism published up to his time in European languages in his *Essai de Bibliographie Jaina* (1906) and *Repertoire d'Epigraphie Jaina* (1908) from which we learn that as early as in 1807 three descriptive report on the Jains, based on personal observations, were collected and published by Major Colin Mackenzie in the ninth volume of the *Asiatic Researches* which also contained a well-researched paper by H.T. Colebrooke under the title 'Observations on the sect of the Jains'. Colebrooke's paper was based on Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* and Bhadrabāhu's *Kalpasūtra*. He made use of both in a selective manner only and was far from editing or translating them completely, and twenty years had to pass until the first edited Jain text was published.[1] In Edward Moor's *The Hindu Pantheons* (1810) the Jains were described as a sect of the Buddhists or the Vaiṣṇavas and some imperfect accounts of their tenets, rivalry with the Brāhmaṇas, temples and icons, armorial and forehead marks of the Jinas, etc. were provided.[2] H.H. Wilson's *Sketches of the Religious Sects of the Hindus* which originally appeared in the sixteenth and seventeenth volumes of the *Asiatic Researches* (1814–15)[3] represented the most important treatment of the subject at that time. The first book which had 'the Jains' in its title was W. Francklin's *Researches of the Tenets of the Jeynes and Boodhists* which was published in 1827. In the same year he also published an article in the first volume of the *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic*

[1]Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* was edited by Böhtlingk and Rieu with a German translation in 1847. Bhadrabāhu's *Kalpasūtra*, along with another text called *Navatattvaprakaraṇa*, came out in 1848 with the English rendering by J. Stevenson.

[2]Moor also published two papers on Jainism in the *Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register* (vol. IX, 1820 and vol. XVII, 1824), respectively under the titles 'Bombay and Western India' and 'The Jains'.

[3]Published in book form in 1846.

Society.[4] Wilson's Descriptive Catalogue of the Mackenzie Collection (1828) dealt with 44 South Indian Jain manuscripts that had come to the East India Company in London.

J. Stevenson, whose English translation of the *Kalpasūtra* (1848) has already been mentioned, was the first European scholar to deal with the canonical Prākrit. Weber's edition of Dhaneśvara's *Śatruñjayamāhātmya* came out in 1858 with a detailed preface which was followed by Lassen's 'Sketch of Jainism' (1861).[5] It goes, however, to the credit of Weber to install the study of Jainism on a solid platform. His epoch-making *Über ein Fragment der Bhagavati*, etc. came out in 1866–67.[6] It was followed by his treatise *Über die heiligen Schriften der Jaina* (1883–85)[7] which was based upon the Jain manuscripts acquired by the Royal Library of Berlin (1873–78) and his descriptive catalogue of the same, published in two big volumes (1888–92), contained elaborate analyses, very useful to the study of philology, literature, history and religion. The manuscripts thus described by Weber came to Berlin owing to an agreement between Georg Bühler and the Department of Public Instruction at Bombay which had commissioned him and other scholars in their service with the careful examination of private collections and the purchase of manuscripts at government costs. Bühler was allowed to acquire manuscripts even for foreign libraries provided they were doubles. The manuscripts thus collected were catalogued in the *Reports* of Bhandarkar,[8] Paterson,[9] Jacobi, Klatt and Leumann,[10] Pulle[11] and others.[12] The first collection of the canonical writings *Āgama Saṅgraha* was printed

[4]This volume also contained two articles under the same title 'On the Sarwacs or Jains' written respectively by Delamaine and Buchanan Hamilton, Colebrooke's account of two inscriptions and Wilson's paper on the philosophy of the Hindus in which Colebrooke's previous study of Jainism was reviewed.

[5]*Indische Altertumskunde*, IV, 755–87.

[6]It was first published in two parts in *Abhandlungen Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaftenzu Berlin*, 1865–66.

[7]*Indische Studien*, XVI–XVII; Eng. trans. H.W. Smyth in *Ind. Ant.*, XVII–XXI, 1888–92.

[8]*Report* for 1882–83, Bombay, 1884; for 1883–84, Bombay, 1897.

[9]*Reports* I–IV, for 1882–92 in *Journal of the Bombay Royal Asiatic Society*, vols. XVI-XVIII (all in extra number) *Report* V for 1892-95, Bombay, 1896; *Report* VI for 1895-98, Bombay, 1899.

[10]*ZDMG*, XXXIII, 478 ff., 693 ff; XLV, 454 ff.; XLVII, 308 ff.

[11]L. Pulle, *Catalogue die manoscretti giainici*, 1894.

[12]'An Alphabetical List of Jain MSS belonging to the Govt. in the Oriental Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal' in *Journal and Proceedings of the ASB*, IV, 1908, 407-40;

between 1875 and 1885 in Calcutta, Bombay, Benaras and Allahabad. These went to Europe through the efforts of Ray Dhanapai Siṃha Bahadur of Azimganj (Murshidabad, Bengal). Jain studies of Bühler and Weber inspired some German scholars to work seriously on Jainism especially on the Jain texts.[13]

Hermann Jacobi, under the shadow of Bühler's influence, edited the *Kalpasūtra* of Bhadrabāhu (1879) and later made a translation of it (*SBE*, XXII, 1884) which was qualitatively different from the earlier one made by Stevenson in regard to merit. His introduction to the *Kalpasūtra* came to be regarded as fundamental for all further research. He also edited the *Ācārāṅga Sūtra* (1883) and the *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* of Hemacandra (1883). Warren's edition of the *Nirayāvaliao* was published in 1879 with introduction, analysis and glossary in Dutch. Leumann, who was the pupil of Weber, edited the *Uvavaiya* (*Aupapātika Sūtra*) in 1883 with notes and glossary. It was Leumann who brought to our notice the importance of the Prākrit commentarial literature, the *Nijjutis* and *Cuṇṇis*, which according to him was 'indispensable for the exploration of the Jain literature of several centuries'. He began to work on these texts since 1892, not on the basis of the prints but on that of the manuscripts collected by him. His *Āvaśyaka-Erzählungens* (1897) was not, however, continued after the publication of the first series. By 1900, he prepared *Übersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur* for publication on the basis of manuscript-materials collected by him[14] for the purpose of laying bare the different layers of an extensive scholastic literature. By this great work he was much ahead of his time. Unfortunately, printing of this work was stopped when the fourteenth form had been composed. It was not until 1934 that this

A. Guerinot, 'Notes de Bibliographie Jaina' in *Journal Asiatique*, XIV, 1909, 47–148; S.D. Gupta, *A Collection of Sanskrit Prakrit and Hindi Works in the Jaina Siddhānta Bhavana*, Arrah, 1919; C.D. Dalal, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Jain Bhandars of Jesalmere* (ed. with introduction, indexes and notes on unpublished works and their authors by L.B. Gandhi), GOS, XXI, Baroda, 1923; Hira Lal, *Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts published under the order of the Govt. of C.P. and Berar*, Nagpur, 1926; H.D. Velankar, *Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS in the Bombay branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (III–IV) *Jain and Vernacular Literatures*, Bombay, 1930; H.R. Kapadia, *Descriptive Catalogue of the MSS of the Bhandarkar Institute*, 1935; etc.

[13]Ernst Windisch's study of the researches on Indian philology and literature (1917–21) contained an assessment of researches in this line. Informations on Jain studies in Italian up to 1911 were contained in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, V, 219–71. See also C.L. Jain's *Jaina Bibliography*, Calcutta, 1945.

[14]*ZDMG*, XLV–XLVI.

great work came to light thanks to the endeavour of W. Schubring. Another unpublished work on bio-bibliographical materials of Jainism, J. Klatt's *Onomasticon*[15] should be mentioned in this connection. Eight volumes from his own hand in alphabetical order contained what was within his reach to collect data concerning Jain authors and works. His unfortunate demise prevented the publication of this work estimated to fill some 1100 pages in print. After his death Weber and Leumann published in 1892 its 55 pages under the title, 'Specimen of a literary-biographical Onomasticon by Dr. J. Klatt'. The *Uvāsagadasāo* in the original Prākrit with the Sanskrit commentary of Abhayadeva and an English translation with notes was edited by A.F.R. Hoernle (Calcutta, 1885–88).

The canonical texts and their commentaries were written in Prākrit dialects and it was not until a later period that the Jains—the Śvetāmbaras from the eighth century and the Digambaras somewhat earlier—used Sanskrit for commentaries and other learned works.[16] From the tenth century onwards there was a transition to the Apabhraṃśa dialects. The edition of the canonical texts did not, however, go on methodically. R. Pischel hoped that continued Jain research in Europe should have led to the origin of a Jain or Prākrit Text Society as a counterpart of the well known Pali Text Society.[17] But Pischel's idea materialised half a century later in 1953. The Agamodaya Samiti, which was founded at Mehsana in 1915, however came forward to publish most works of the Śvetāmbara canon and many more non-canonical texts. Other Jain organisations followed suit.[18] As a result of all these efforts

[15]'Onomastics' means the science of the origins and forms of words, especially as used in a specialised field; also applied in the case of proper names of persons or places. It is from Greek *onomastikos*; in French it is *onomastein* (from *onoma*, i.e. name).

[16]Jain Sanskrit was of three kinds: simple Sanskrit, sophisticated Sanskrit in the *kāvya* style and Sanskrit mixed with Prākritisms. See M. Bloomfield, 'Some Aspects of Jain Sanskrit' in *Festschrift Wackernagel*, 1923, 220 ff.

[17]It is interesting to note that Jacobi's edition of the *Ācārāṅgasūtra* was published by the Pali Text Society.

[18]Learned societies such as the Jain Dharma Prakāśa Sabhā in Bhavnagar, the Jain Vidyā Prasāraka Varga in Palitana, the Jain Jñāna Prasāraka Varga in Bombay, the Jain Vidyāśālā in Ahmedabad, Jain Sūtra Battīsī in Hyderabad, Srī-Sūtrāgama Prakāśaka Samiti, Gurgaon, etc. contributed a lot to the publication of the Jain texts. Jain saints like Vijaya Dharma Suri and wealthy persons such as Devchand Lalbhai Jhaveri, Bhagavai Mansukkhai and others also associated themselves with the publication of the Jain texts. Cf. *infra*.

when much about the Jain texts was known, attempts were also made to make a historical survey of the origin and development of both of the canonical and non-canonical literature of the Jains. The ground for preparing a well-documented history of Jain literature was prepared by Bühler,[19] Jacobi[20] and Hoernle.[21] U.N. Barodia's *History and Literature of Jainism* (Bombay, 1909) was also a pioneering work in this field, though as a research work it was not upto the mark. The most authoritatitve treatment was to be found in Maurice Winternitz's *Geschichte der Indischen Literature*[22] in which all the Jain texts and the results of the scholarly studies on them were arranged systematically in an historical sequence and assessed in an analytical and at the same time critical perspective. The canonical texts were also exhaustively dealt with in W. Schubring's *Die Lehre der Jainas*[23] and in H:R. Kapadia's *A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas.*[24]

As we have stated earlier, various editions of the Jain canonical texts along with their commentaries were published in India by different organisations. Among these the Āgama Saṃgraha and Āgamodaya editions of the Aṅga texts are listed below because they are better known.[25] We have already had the occasion to refer to Jacobi's edition (1882) and translation of the Āyāra (*Ācāraṅga*). The Bambhaceraim section (Rules for the Holy Life) was re-edited by W. Schubring in 1910 and translated in German by him in 1926.[26] The *Sūyagaḍa* (*Sūtrakṛta* or *Sucīkṛta*) was translated into

[19]*Wiener Zeitschrift*, I–IV, 1887–90. Reference has already been made Weber's 'Sacred literature of the Jains' translated into English by H.W. Smyth in *Ind. Ant.*, XVII–XXI.

[20]Intro. to the *Kalpasūtra*, 14 ff., *SBE*, XXII, XLV and *ZDMG*, XXVIII, 1 ff.

[21]Intro. to his trans. of the *Uvāsagadasāo* and also in *Proc. of the ASB*, 1898, 39 ff.

[22]Vol. II, part II, Leipzig, 1920 ; Eng. trans., Calcutta, 1933, 424–595. Its adaptation *The Jainas in the History of Indian Literature* was edited by Jinavijaya Muni, Ahmedabad, 1946.

[23]Bulin end Leipzig, 1935. [24]Bombay, 1947.

[25]*Āyāra* (AG, 1916), *Sūyagaḍa* (AS 1881, AG 1917), *Ṭhāna* (AS 1880, AG 1918–19), *Samavāya* (AS 1880, AG 1918), *Viyāhapannatī* (AG 1918–21), *Nāyādhammakahāo* (AS 1877, AG 1919), *Uvāsagadasāo* (AG 1920, revised ed., P.L. Vaidya, Poona, 1930, Schubring, 1931), *Antagaḍadasāo* (AG 1920, rev. ed. with intro. gloss, notes and app. by P.L. Vaidya, Poona, 1932), *Anuttarovavaiyadasāo* (same as above), *Paṇhāvāgaraṇaim* (AG 1919), and *Vivāgasuya* (AS 1875, AG 1820, ed. with intro. and notes by P.L. Vaidya, Poona, 1933).

[26]W. Schubring, *Worte Mahavīras*, Gottingen, 1926, 66–121.

English by Jacobi in 1895. Its seven chapters were translated into German by Schubring in his *Worte Mahaviras.*[27] *The Viāhapannati* (*Vyākhyāprajñapti* or *Bhagavatīsūtra*) was first studied by Weber in 1865–66. Portions of this text were translated into German by W. Schubring.[28] A Gujarati rendering was made by Bechardas in 1927. On the *Nāyādhammakahā* (*Jñātādharmakathā*) two important research works were made in German respectively by Paul Steinthal (1881) and W. Huttemann (1907).[29] Mention has already been made of Hoernle's English translation of the *Uvāsagadasāo* (1888). The *Antagaḍadasāo* and *Anuttarovavāiyadasāo* were translated into English by L.D. Barnett in 1907. The *Paṇhāvāgaraṇaim* was specially studied by Amulya Chandra Sen.[30] Among the Uvaṅgas (Upāṅgas), the *Uvavāiya* (*Aupapatika Sūtra*) was edited with extensive summary of contents, text and glossary by E. Leumann (Leipzig, 1883).[31] The *Rāyapaseṇaijja*[32] was also exhaustively treated by him on the basis of its contents in the same year.[33] The contents of the *Surapannatti* were dealt with by Weber,[34] Thibaut[35] and Shamasastry[36] while the *Jambuddīwapannatti* was extensively used by Wilibald Kirfel in his *Kosmographie der Inder*, (Bonn, 1920). The *Nirayāvaliāo* was edited by S. Warren (Amsterdam, 1879).[37] Other texts of the Uvaṅga category, including also those mentioned above, were published in the Āgama Saṃgraha and Āgamodaya series. The *Vivaraṇa* was edited with introduction, glossary, notes and appendices by P.L. Vaidya (Poona, 1932). Five among the ten works of the Paiṇṇa category—*Causaraṇa, Bhattaparinnā, Saṃthāra, Āurapaccakkhāna* and *Mahāpaccakkhāna*—were specially studied by

[27]For a critical study of the *Sūyagaḍa* see Ghatage in *IHQ*, XII, 270–81.

[28]*Die Jainas* (in *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch von. A. Bertholet*), Tubingen, 1927.

[29]P. Steinthal, *Specimen der Nāyāhammakahā*, Berlin, 1881; W. Huttemann *Die Jñāta-Erzählungen im sechsten Anga des Kanons der Jinisten*, Strassburg, 1907.

[30]A.C. Sen, *A Critical Introduction to the Paṇhavāgaraṇaim*, (Thesis), Hamburg, 1936.

[31]AS 1880, AG 1916; portions translated (Ger.) by Schubring in *Die Jainas*.

[32]AS 1880, AG 1925.

[33]*Proceedings of the Sixth Oriental Conference*, Leiden, 1883, III (2), 490 ff.

[34]*Indische Studien*, X, 1863, 254 ff.

[35]*JASB*, XL, 107 ff.

[36]*QJMS*, XV, 138–47; XVI, 201–12.

[37]Cf. Jacobi in *ZDMG*, XXXIV, 178 ff.

Kurt von Kamptz.[38] There are five more Paiṇṇa texts—*Tandulaveyāliya, Camdavijjhaya, Devindatthaya, Ganivijjā* and *Viratthaya*—which have been published by the Āgamodaya and other organisations. Among the texts of the Cheyasutta category, the eighth section of the *Āyāradasāo* is known as the *Kalpasūtra* of Bhadrabahu which, as we have seen above, was edited (1879) and translated (1882) by Jacobi. The old genuine *Kalpasūtra* is *Kappa* also known as *Bṛhat-Kalpasūtra* was edited with the text, interpretation, summary of contents and glossary in 1905 by Schubring[39] who also edited the *Vavahāra* and the *Nisiha*.[40] The *Mahānisiha* was also edited by Schubring (1918). The *Pañcakappa*, now non-existent, was substituted by the *Jiyakappa* of Jinabhadra which was edited with extracts from Siddhasena's *cūrṇi* by Leumann in 1892.[41] Among the Mūlasuttas, the *Uttarajjhāyā* or *Uttarādhyayana Sūtra* was edited by Jarl Charpentier (1922) and translated into English by Jacobi (1895).[42] The *Dasaveyāliya* was edited and translated in German by Leumann along with the Nijjutti in 1892.[43] The study of the *Avassaya* (which has come down only in conjunction with the *Nijjutti*) by Leumann has already been referred to. The *Piṇḍa-Nijjutti* and the *Oha-Nijjutti* were published by the Indian concerns along with their commentaries (1918–19). This also holds good in the case of the *Nandi* and the *Anuogadāra*. The *Isibhāsiyam* was edited by Schubring in 1942[44] and the *Aṅgavijjā* by Puṇyavijaya.[45]

Leumann in his study of the Nijjuttis suggested that they were the earliest commentaries which were closely interwoven with the Sūtras or even supplanted the latter. At a later date, these Nijjuttis were extended to form exhaustive commentaries in Prākrit

[38] *Über die vom Sterbefasten handelnden älteren Paiṇṇa des Jaina-Kanons*, Hamburg, 1929.

[39] *Das Kalpasūtra*, Leipzig, 1905; Eng. trans., May S. Burgess, *Ind. Ant.*, XXXIX, 257 ff.

[40] *Vavahāra-und Nisiha-Sutta*, Leipzig, 1918; Nagari retranscription along with Gujarati trans. by J.G. Doshi, 1925.

[41] Also edited by Muni Jinavijaya, 1926.

[42] *SBE*, LXV. Also ed. by Muni Sri Jayantavijaya, Agra, 1923–27.

[43] *ZDMG*, XLVI, 581–663; trans. by Schubring, Ahmedabad, 1932; M.V. Patwardhan, *The Dasaveyaliya: A Study*, Sangli, 1933–36; cf. L. Alsdorf in *Indian Linguistics*, XVI, 21–28; Ghatage in *JBORS*, 1953, 432–39.

[44] *Nachr. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss* 1942, 489–576; 1952, 21–52 (with a Sanskrit *chāyā*).

[45] Prakrit Text Society pub., vol.I, 1957.

(Bhāṣyas and Cūrṇis). These in their turn formed the foundation for the Sanskrit commentaries (Ṭīkās, Vṛttis, Avacūrṇis) which were compiled between the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[46] Jacobi held that an older form of Jain Maharastri appeared in the Cūrṇis, Kathānakas and Āvaśyaka narratives and that the language of the verses differed from that of the prose.[47] He had also reproduced the most interesting tales from the commentaries.[48] The legend of the Jina Pārśva was edited and translated by Jarl Charpentier from Devendra gaṇin's commentary.[49] The adoption of the popular Buddhist, Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical themes, legends of the epics and the Purāṇas, in the Jain sacred writings and commentaries was pointed out by Fick, Jacobi, Holtzmann, Pavolini, Charpentier, Meyer, Seidenstucker, Hertel and others. The Prākrit epic *Paumacariya* by Vimala Suri which probably served as a model for all the later adaptations of the Rāma legend among the Jains was edited by Jacobi in 1914. Jinasena's *Harivaṃsa Purāṇa*, based on the *Mahābhārata*, was edited by Darbari Lal.[50] The *Triṣṭilakṣaṇa Mahāpurāṇa* by Jinasena and Guṇabhadra was studied by Glasenapp[51] on the edition of the text and its Hindi translation by Lalaram Jain. The *Śatruñjaya Māhātmya* was studied as early as in 1858 by Weber. It was subsequently translated in 1901 with appendices by J. Burgess.[52] Canto I of Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭhiśalākāpuruṣacarita* (Bhavnagar, 1906–13) was translated by Amulyacharan Vidyabhushan with notes and introduction by B.D. Jain (1925).[53] Mention has already been made of Jacobi's edition of Hemacandra's *Pariśiṣṭaparvan* (1891) extracts of which were translated into German by J. Hertel (1908).[54] The *Caritras* which describe the life of the individual Jinas were mostly edited and a few translated into

[46] *ZDMG*, XLVI, 1892, 556 ff.

[47] *Über das Prakrit in der Erzählungs-Litteratur der Jainas*, RSO, II, Rome, 1909, 231 ff.

[48] *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Maharastri*, Leipzig, 1886; Eng. trans. by J.J. Meyer, *Hindu Tales*, London, 1909.

[49] *ZDMG*, LXIX, 1915, 321–359.

[50] Mānikachandra Digambara Granthamālā, XXXII–XXXIII. An analysis of this work was given by R.L. Mitra in his *Notices of Sanskrit MSS*, VI, 1882, 74–97.

[51] Festgabe Jacobi, 331 ff.

[52] *Ind. Ant.*, XXX, 209 ff., 288 ff.

[53] Punjab Sanskrit Series, no. 8.

[54] *Erzählungen aus Hemacandras Pariśiṣṭaparvan*, Leipzig, 1908.

European and modern Indian languages. Many works belonging to this category were also composed in the Apabhraṃśa. An analysis of the *Pārśvanātha Caritra* of Bhavadeva Suri was given by Bloomfield (1918) who also suggested numerous parallels from Indian and World literature.[55] Among the works belonging to the semi-historical Prabandha category the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga was edited by R.C. Dinanatha (1888),[56] Prabhacandra's *Prabhāvaka Caritra* by H.M. Sharma (1908) and Jinaprabha's *Tirthakalpa* by D.R. Bhandarkar and K.N. Sahityabhushan (1923). Among the religious novels the *Taraṅgalolā* was translated into German by E. Leumann (1921), Haribhadra's *Samarāicca Kahā* was edited (1908, 1926) by H. Jacobi with the text and an introduction containing a summary of the work.

Siddharṣi's *Upamitibhāvaprapañcakathā* was edited by Paterson and Jacobi (1899–14).[57] The latter also edited Dhanavāla's Apabhraṃśa work *Bhavisatta Kahā* (1918). It was also edited by C.D. Dalal which was completed with introduction, notes, glossary , etc. by P.D. Gune (1923). The Malayasundarī legends were especially studied by Hertel (1919), whose interest was also on the works of the Campu category.[58] The Kathānakas or religious short stories especially evoked much interest among the European scholars. The *Kālakācārya-Kāthanaka* was edited and translated by Jacobi (1880);[59] the *Uttamakumāra-carita* (ed. and trans.) by Weber (1884);[60] the *Pāpabuddhi-Dharmabuddhi* (ed. and Italian trans.) by E. Loarini (1884);[61] the *Campakaśreṣṭhī* (analysis) by Weber in 1883 and (ed. and Eng. trans.) by Hertel (1911);[62] the *Aghaṭa-Kumāra* (German trans.) by Charlotte Krause (1922); *Ratnacūḍa* (German trans. by

[55]M. Bloomfield, *The Life and Stories of the Jaina Saviour Pārśvanātha*, Baltimore, 1919.

[56]Eng. trans. by C.H. Tawney, Calcutta, 1901.

[57]German trans. of Books I–III was made by W. Kirfel, Leipzig, 1924, Italian trans. by A. Ballini in *Giornale della societa Asiatica Italiana*, 1904–11, XVII–XIX, XXI–XXIV.

[58]Kuppuswami Sastri edited *Gadyacintāmaṇi* (1902), *Kṣatracuḍāmaṇi* (1903) and *Jivandhara* (1905); Hiralal Hamsaraj, *Mṛgāvati-caritra* (1909), *Mahipāla-caritra* (1909) and Māṇikya Suri's *Yaśodhara-caritra* (1910); Gopinath Rao, Vādirāja's *Yaśo-dhara-caritra* (1912); Raje Vijay, *Surasundari-cariam* (1915), etc. The *Yaśastilaka* and *Tilakamañjari* were edited in the Kāvyamālā series (1901–03).

[59]*ZDMG*, XXXIV, 247–318; XXXV, 675 ff.; Leumann in *ZDMG*, XXXVII, 493 ff.

[60]Cf. Hertel in *Festgabe Jacobi*, 135 ff.

[61]*Giornale della societa Asiatica Italiana*, III, 34–127.

[62]*ZDMG*, XV, 1911, 1–51, 425–70; German trans. by the same 1922.

Hertel); etc. Among other Jain narrative works, the *Samyaktvakaumudī* was edited by Weber (1889), *Kathākośa* translated (1888) and edited (1897–98) by F.L. Pullé,[63] *Ārādhana-Kathākośa* by C.H. Tawney (1895), *Antarakathā-saṃgraha* partly translated into Italian translated by Hertel (1920) deserve special mention. The vast Stotra literature and collections of didactic poems were published in India by various organisations.[64] Among these the *Bhaktāmara*, *Mandira* and *Sobhana* Stotras were edited and translated into German by Jacobi (1878)[65] and the *Ṛṣabhapañcāśikā* by Klatt (1879).[66] The *Uvaesamālā* of Dharmadāsa, a didactic poem in 540 Prākrit stanzas, was edited by L.P. Tessitori in 1912.[67] The *Subhāṣitaratnasaṃdoha* was edited and translated by R. Schmidt and J. Hertel (1905, 1907).[68] Amitagati's polemical *Dharmaparīkṣā* was studied by N. Mirnov (1903).[69] Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra* was originally edited and translated in parts into German by Windisch (1874)[70] and into Italian by F. Belloni Filippi (1908).[71] Somaprabha's *Kumārapālapratibodha* was edited and translated by L. Alsdorf (1929).[72]

Among the doctrinal and philosophical works, there were 83 treatises by the great Digambara author Kundakunda (who is also cited with esteem by the Śvetāmbaras) of which only seven are known. Kundakunda wrote only in Prākrit. His *Pañcatthiyasāra* (*Pañcāstikāyasāra* or the Five Cosmic constituents) was edited in 1920 by A. Chakravartinayanar with philosophical and historical

[63]Cf. Zachariae in *Kline Schriften*, 65 ff.

[64]Kāvyamālā ed., 1890; Yaśovijaya Granthamālā (1905) etc.

[65]*Ind. Stud.*, XIV, 359 ff., 376 ff.; *ZDMG*, XXXII, 509 ff.

[66]*ZDMG*, XXXIII, 445 ff.

[67]*Giornale della societa Asiatica Italiana*, XXV, 167–297.

[68]*ZDMG*, XLIX, LXI.

[69]*Die Dharmapariksā des Amitagati*, Leipzig, 1903; cf. R. Pischel, *ZDMG*, LVIII, 1904, 365 ff.

[70]*ZDMG*, XXVIII, 185–262.

[71]*Giornale della societa Asiatica Italiana*, XXI, 123 ff.

[72]Alsdorf's *Apabhraṃśa Studien*, Leipzig, 1937 is fundamental for the study of later Jain literature. Among the Apabhraṃśa Jain works the following may be noted: *Sanatkumāra-caritam* (ed. Jacobi, 1921); *Kālasvarūpa-Kulakam* (L.B. Gandhi, 1927); *Vairāgyasāra* (Velankar, *ABORI*, 1928, 272–80); *Jasahara-cariu* (P.L. Vaidya, 1931); *Saṇjama-mañjari* (P.D. Gune, *ABORI*, I, 157–66); *Pāhuḍadohā* (H.L. Jain, 1933); *Nāyakumāra-cariu* (H.L. Jain, 1933); *Karakaṇḍa-cariu* (H.L. Jain, 1934); *Paramappayāsu* (A.N. Upadhye, 1937); *Yogasāra* (A.N. Upadhya, 1937); *Mahāpurāṇa* of Puṣpadanta (P.L. Vaidya, 1937–41); *Paumacariu* of Svayambhu (H.C. Bhayani, 1953), etc.

introduction, translation, notes and an original commentary in English.[73] This work, together with *Pavayanasāra* (*Pravacanasāra*, a text composed in Prākrit *gāthās* on dogmatics, psychology and ethics) and *Samayasāra* (kernel or essence of the doctrine in 414 Prākrit stanzas) forms a trilogy (Prābhṛtatraya or Nāṭakatraya). Umāsvāmin's (who is called Umāsvāti by the Śvetāmbaras) *Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra* (the manual for the understanding of the True Nature of Things) which is recognised as one of the most authoritative works of logic, psychology, cosmography, ontology and ethics by both Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras was first edited with the commentary (together with a few minor works of Umāsvāmi in the appendices) by Vakil Keshavlal Premchand Mody in 1903–05 (*Bib. Ind.*). It was translated into German in 1906 by Jacobi[74] and in English with introduction, notes and commentary by J.L. Jaini in 1920.[75] Siddhasena Divākara's *Nyāyāvatāra*, which forms a part of the *Dvātriṃśad-Dvātriṃśikā* and is a fundamental work on Jain logic was edited in 1909 with commentary and an English translation by Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana.[76] Samantabhadra (8th century) wrote a commentary on Umasvāmin's *Tattvārtha*. The introduction to this commentary is known as *Āptamīmāṃsā* which was edited in the Sanātana Jain Granthamālā Series (1905, 1910) and treated in Vidyābhusana's *History of Indian Logic*. His second work *Yuktyanuśāsana* was also edited in the same series. Akalaṅkadeva also made a commentary on the *Tattvārtha* entitled *Tattvārtharāja Vārtika* and composed several logical treatises under the titles *Nyāyaviniścaya*, *Laghiyastraya* and *Svarūpasambodhana* which were all edited in the Sanātana Jain Granthamālā and Maṇikachandra Digambara Jain Granthamālā series. Vidyānanda's *Aṣṭasahasrī*, a commentary on Akalaṅka's *Aṣṭaśatī* (a com. on Samantabhadra's *Āptamīmāṃsā*), *Tattvārthaśloka-vārttika* (a com. on Umāsvāmin's *Tattvārtha*), *Āptaparīkṣā*, *Patraparīkṣā*,

[73] Also edited by Pavolini in *Giornale*, XIV, 1901, 1–40.

[74] *ZDMG*, 287 ff., 512 ff.

[75] *Sacred Books of the Jainas*, vol.II, Arrah. The *Praśamarati-prakaraṇa*, ascribed to Umāsvāmi, published in the appendix to K.P. Mody's edition of the *Tattvārtha*, was edited with a com. and translated into Italian by A. Ballini in *Giornale*, XXV, 1912, 117 ff.; XXIX, 1918–20, 61 ff. Pujyapāda Devanandin's commentary on Umāsvāmin's work, *Sarvārthasiddhi* was published from Kolhapur in 1904. Cf. Jacobi in *ZDMG*, 1906, 290.

[76] Siddhasena's *Sammatitarkasūtra* was edited with Abhayadeva's com. *Tattvabodhini* in Yaśovijaya Jain Granthamālā, no. 13.

Pramāṇanirṇaya and *Pramāṇaparīkṣā* were all edited and published between 1914 and 1918 in the Gandhinatharanga and Sanātana Jain Granthamālā series of Bombay. Māṇikyanandin's *Parīkṣāmukhasūtra* and Śubhacandra's *Jñānārṇava* or *Yogapradīpādhikāra* were published respectively in the Sanātana (1905) and Rāyacandra (1907) Jain Granthamālā series. Haribhadra's *Yogavindu* and *Yogadṛṣṭisamuccaya* (ed. L. Suali, 1911–12) and *Dharmavindu* (ed. and Italian trans. by the same, 1908)[77] were written from a pure Jain point of view. This also holds good in the case of his *Śrāvakaprajñapti* (ed. K.P. Mody, Bombay, 1905) which is a systematic treatise of the Jain religion for lay adherents. But in his celebrated *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*[78] in which most Indian philosophies have been discussed he revealed an astonishingly impartial attitude which is also reflected in his *Lokatattvanirṇaya*.[79] He also proved his unbiasedness by writing a commentary on the *Nyāyapraveśa* of the Buddhist Diṅnāga.[80] Cāmuṇḍarāya's *Dravyasaṃgraha* and *Gommaṭasāra* were edited with introduction, English translation, notes and commentary by S.C. Ghoshal.[81] Śānti Suri's *Jivavicāra* was edited and translated into French in 1902 by Guerinot.[82]

We have thus dealt with the publications of the editions and translations of the Jain texts up to the 1920s. We have already had the occasion to refer to the bibliographies of Guerinot and C.L. Jain. The *Jaina Granthāvalī* published by the Śvetāmbara Jain Conference in 1908 was also a descriptive bibliography so far as the texts were concerned. But a modern standard was not reached until 1944 when Velankar's *Jinaratnakoṣa* appeared. Jain literary researches received further impetus by the compilations of the catalogues of private libraries, collections of Paṭṭāvalis, Praśastis, biographies, etc. and the publication of the *Abhidhānarājendra* (Ratlam, 1913–25)—a Sanskrit encyclopaedia in seven volumes whose Prākrit catchwords were taken from the canonical and scholastic literature of the Śvetāmbaras—by Vijayarajendra Suri. Among other texical works, a glossary of the canon in three lan-

[77] *Giornale*, XXI, 223 ff.

[78] Ed. by F.L. Pullee in *Giornale*, I, 1888, 47 ff., VIII, 1895, 159 ff.; IX, 1896, 1 ff., ed. with Guṇaratna's *Tarkarahasyadīpikā* by L. Suali in *Bib. Indi.*, 1905 ff.

[79] Ed. and trans. into Italian by L. Suali in *Giornale*, XVIII, 1905, 263 ff.

[80] N.D. Mitrov in *Festgabe Garbe*, 37 ff.

[81] *Sacred Books of the Jains*, I, V, VI, Arrah, 1917 and 1927.

[82] *Journal Asiatique*, XIX, 231 ff.

guages were prepared by Muni Ratnacandra in five volumes (Indaur, 1923–32) under the title *Illustrated Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary*. Pandit Haragovind Das Sheth's *Pāia-Sadda-Mahārṇava, A Complete Prākrit-Hindi Dictionary* (1928) dealt with all forms of Prākrit. Precise data of places as well as large supplements given in this volume contributed immensely to the cause of historical research. Among the earlier periodicals we should like to mention *Anekānt, Jain Antiquary, Jain Hitaiṣī*, etc. in which the literature and history of Jainism were discussed by both Jain and non-Jain scholars. Other journals devoted to Indological researches also contained valuable articles on Jainism. Nearest related to the periodicals were the *granthamālā* series, of which we have already had the occasion to refer. In many cases they represented a very remarkable file including rare and significant works provided with a scholarly introduction. The Yaśovijaya Jain Granthamālā, apparently the oldest of the Jain series, was started in 1904 which was followed by Ātmānanda Grantharatnamālā (1911), Āgamodaya Samiti (1915), Devchand Lalbhai Jain Pustakoddhāra, Māṇikacandra Jain Granthamālā (1915), Śrī Rāyacandra Jain Śāstra Granthamālā (1916), Sanātana Jain Granthamālā (1917), etc. The Digambara enthusiasts started the 'Sacred Books of the Jains' series 1917 from Arrah in Bihar. Among subsequent enterprises mention may be made of the Singhi Jain Granthamālā series (1933), which started publishing Śvetāmbara works under the editorship of Muni Jinavijaya, and the Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jain Granthamālā.[83]

We have already had the occasion to refer to Jacobi's introduction to the *Kalpasūtra* (Leipzig, 1879) and also to the introduction of his English translation of the *Jain Sūtras* (Oxford, 1884)[84] which served as the foundation for all the future studies on Jainism. In many of his stray articles also he had tried to present various aspects of Jainism in an historical outline.[85] Ram Chandra Basu's

[83]See E. Hultzsch in *Ind. Ant.*, XXXIX, 1910, 228; Jacobi in *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, XIII, 1910, 615 ff.; XVIII, 1915, 275–76.

[84]*SBE*, XXII.

[85]Cf. 'On Mahāvīra and His Predecessors' in *Ind.Ant.*, IX, 1880, 158–63. It deals with the history of the Tīrthaṅkaras with special reference to Mahāvīra and his relation with Gośāla. 'Some Aspects of Jainism' in *Jour. Mahābodhi Society*, XII, 1914, 83–90. It demonstrates the independence of Jainism as a monastic religion and deals with the literature, religious and philosophical tenets and ethics of the Jains. Among his other important articles mention should be made of 'On the Metaphysics and Ethics of the Jainas' in *Trans. Third. Cong. for the Hist. of Rel.*, II, 59–66; 'Art. on Jainism' in *ERE*, VII, 465 ff., in *Sitzungs-berichte*, Berlin, 1929, 322 ff.

Jainism and Its Founder which came out from Calcutta in 1886 was an elaborate treatment on the life and historicity of Ṛṣabhanātha and also of Mahāvīra and his immediate predecessors. A new horizon in the field of Jain studies was opened with the publication in 1887 *Über die Sekte der Jainas*,[86] a lecture dealing with the tenets, mythology, philosophy and ritual of the Jains delivered in Germany after he returned from India. A wider theoretical dimension was revealed in A. Bastian's *Kosmogonien und Theogonien indischer religionphilosophien besonders der Jaina* (Berlin, 1892) which contained a detailed account of the theory of the origin of the world and the hierarchy of deities according to the Jain standpoint. F.O. Schrader was the first to make a comparative study of various religious and philosophical school current in the time of the Buddha and Mahāvīra (363 school according to the Jain texts divided under four groups of Kriyāvāda, Akriyāvāda, Ajñānavāda and Vinayavāda; 62 according to the Buddhist texts divided into two broad categories of Purvānta and Aparānta Kalpikas) and of their contemporary teachers such as Pūraṇa, Pakudha, Ajita, Sañjaya, Gośāla and others in his *Über den Stand der indischen Philosophie zur Zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas* (Strassburg, 1902).

Benarasi Dass's *A Lecture on Jainism* (Agra, 1902)[87] was done from a typical Indian Jain viewpoint with the professed aim of clearing the misconceptions and misunderstandings by which the earlier studies of Jainism were characterised. Early European scholars, even belonging to the rank of Weber, who made serious studies in Jain literature, held that Jainism was an offshoot of Buddhism. Others thought that it was a form of Hinduism. Although Jacobi conclusively established the separate identity of Jainism, the misunderstandings did not cease to exist.[88] Benarasi Dass dealt with the causes of the misconceptions and asserted that Jainism was neither a product of Brahmanism nor of Buddhism, made an historical survey of Jainism on the basis of texts and

[86]Eng. trans. by J. Burgess, *On the Indian Sect of the Jainas*, London, 1903.

[87]Jain Itihas Series, no. 1.

[88]In a broader sense and from an historical point of view Buddhism and Jainism cannot be dissociated from the entirety of the Hindu tradition. These were typical sects like many others of their kind; but in course of time these two systems acquired new dimensions and a universal character.

inscriptions, initiated a comparative philosophical study with reference to other Indian systems and threw light on the tenets of Jain *ratnatraya*, eleven *pratimās*, *daśa-lakṣaṇi-dharma* and twelve *anuprekṣās*. He also tried to explain why the Jain monks were naked and why the Jains worshipped naked images. A.B. Latthe's *An Introduction to Jainism* (Bombay, 1905) was one of the remarkable earlier attempts to present Jainism in its totality in an historical outline. Manik Chand Jain's *Life of Mahāvīra* (Allahabad, 1908) was also a serious historical study dealing with the historicity of Mahāvīra, sources of information, mythological stories, his family relations, activities and basic teachings in a chronological sequence. We have already had the occasion to refer to U.N. Barodia's *History and Literature of Jainism* (Bombay, 1909). A functional study of the surviving Jainism was made by Sinclair Stevenson in her *Notes on Modern Jainism* (Oxford, 1910) in which the distinctive characteristics of the Śvetāmbara, Digambara and Sthānakavāsī sects had been discussed with reference to their modern practices. Among the philosophical works, M.L. Jhavery's *The First Principles of Jain Philosophy* (London, 1910) was a pioneering work in which the Jain cosmic theories, the *astikāya* and *anastikāya* substances, logic, epistemology and other metaphysical intricacies were discussed. This work contained a learned introduction by L.D. Barnett.[89] Comparative studies in the philosophical aspects of Buddhism and Jainism were initiated by Bohn[90] and Leumann.[91]

A.F. Rudolf Hoernle in the appendix of the second part of his *Uvāsagadasāo* (1888–90) dealt with the interesting career of Gośāla Maṅkhaliputta, the leader of the Ājīvika sect. A more detailed account of the history and doctrines of the Ājīvikas was presented by him in his celebrated article published in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*.[92] J. Charpentier (1910) made a thorough study of the Leśyā theory of the Jains and came to the conclusion that the theory owed its origin to the Ājīvikas.[93] Charpentier's view was

[89]An important article published in 1910 was S.C. Vidyabhusana's 'Yasovijaya Gani' in *Jour. and Proc. of the ASB*, VI, 465 ff. which contained the life of Yaśovijaya (1608–88). His works on logic and his criticism on logic as taught in Benares academies.

[90]'Die Religion des Jaina and ihr Verhä ltnis zum Buddhismus' in *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus*, III, 113–40.

[91]'Buddha and Mahāvīra' in ibid., IV, (separate offprint, Munich, 1921).

[92]I, 259 ff.; see also Leumann in *Wiener Zeitschrift*, III, 328–39.

[93]*Festschrift K.F. Johanson*, Goteborg, 1910, 20–38.

accepted by most later scholars. F.O. Schrader in his study of Indian philosophy of the time of the Buddha and Mahāvīra (1902, the original German title mentioned above) had also dealt with Gośāla and his doctrines. A. Govindacharya Svamin in his article 'A Note on Ājīvikas'[94] (1912) demonstrated that the Ājīvikas were neither Buddhists nor Jains but that they were a distinct religious community. D.R. Bhandarkar in his 'Ājīvikas'[95] refuted the views of Kern and Bühler who suggested that the Ājīvikas were a Vaiṣṇava sect. K.B. Pathak in an article of the same title[96] said that the Ājīvikas were well known to the Jain authors of the later Cālukya and Yādava periods as a sect of the Buddhist Bhikṣus who lived solely or chiefly on *kāñji*. After Hoernle, the most important research on the Ājīvikas was done by B.M. Barua (1920–21).[97] He made a distinction of three periods. The pre-Makkhali period, according to him, was characterised by rise of a religious order of wandering mendicants who called themselves Ājīvikas and probably belonged to the Vaikhānasa order of the hermits. The second or the Makkhali period was characterised by the elevation of the Ājīvika religion into a philosophy of life at the hands of Makkhali Gośāla. The third or the post-Makkhali period was characterised by the further development of Ājīvika religion and absorption of the Ājīvikas into the Digambara Jain, the Śaivite and other sects. Barua had also given an account of the influence of the Ājīvika religion and philosophy on Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism. Facts about the Ājīvikas were also found in A.C. Sen's *Schools and Sects* (1931). The most authoritative work on the Ājīvikas was A.L. Basham's *History and Doctrine of the Ājīvikas* (London, 1951) in which various historical problems pertaining to the study of this sect was exhaustively treated with all references from literature and epigraphs including materials from the South.[98] What Basham was able to prove was that Gośāla inherited a special line of thought from his predecessors which he shared along with his contemporaries, especially with Pūraṇa Kassapa and Pakudha Kaccāyana, who also be-

[94]*Ind. Ant.*, XLI, 1912, 296 ff.

[95]Ibid., 286–90. [96]Ibid., 88 ff.

[97]*The Ājīvikas: History of their Religion and Philosophy*, part I, Historical Summary, Calcutta, 1920; 'The Ajivikas' in *Journal of the Dept. of Letters*, V (2), 1920, 1–80; *A History of the Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy*, Calcutta, 1921.

[98]A thought-provoking review of this excellent work was made by W. Schubring in *ZDMG*, CIV, 256–63.

longed to the same creed. Basham's second achievement was to reconstruct the original Ājīvika line of thought on the basis of scattered fragments of passages found in the Buddhist, Jain and South Indian texts.

Umrao Simha Tank's *Jain Historical Studies* (Delhi, 1914) contained descriptive accounts of the careers of prominent Jains and famous events of Jain history. Sinclair Stevenson's *The Heart of Jainism* (Oxford, 1915) had proved to be a very important, authoritative, thought-provoking and controversial work. It dealt with the life of Mahāvīra; his predecessors and disciples; history of the Jain community; the nine categories of fundamental truths; *Karma* and the path to liberation; the life story of a Jain; the layman and his religious life; the ascetic; the end of the road; worship and religious customs, and mythology, architecture and literature. The last chapter of this book under the title 'Empty Heart of Jainism' evoked strong resentment among the Jains.[99] H. Warren's *Jainism in Western Garb* (Arrah, 1916) was based on the notes of talks and lectures by Virchand R. Gandhi dealing with the Jain approach to the solutions of the problems of modern life. It throws light on the Jain view of the universe, man as he actually is, man as he may become, the end and the means to achieve it. J.L. Jaini's *Outlines of Jainism* (Cambridge, 1916 with a preliminary note by F.W. Thomas and index by H. Warren) described Jainism in broad outlines on the basis of the original texts with special emphasis on the doctrines, ethics and metaphysics. His *The Jaina Law* (Arrah, 1916) was also a pioneering work which became the sourcebook of the Jain legal treatises published subsequently, C.R. Jain's *The Practical Path* (Arrah, 1917) was mainly a philosophical treatise dealing with the methods of Jain philosophy, the *tattvas*, the nature of *karma*, *āsrava*, *bandha*, *saṃvara*, *nirjarā*, *mokṣa*, stages on the path and dharma in practice, also containing appendices and glossary. A monumental contribution of this period to the study of Jainism was P.C. Nahar and K.C. Ghosh's *An Epitome of Jainism, being a Critical Study of its Metaphysics, Ethics and History, etc., in Relation to Modern Thought* (Calcutta, 1917). Its contents are as follows: Introduction; Jainism:

[99]See J.L. Jaini, *A Review of the Heart of Jainism*, Ambala, 1925. O. Pertold suggested that this chapter should be excluded from the book. "I think this sentimental aspect is the least desirable in a modern religion which must go parallel with the fast development of sciences". *The Place and Importance of Jainism in the Comparative Science of Religions*, Bhavnagar, undated, 21.

its philosophy and religion; predicaments by pre-eminence; knowledge and its forms; epistemology and logic; *pratyakṣa* is really *parokṣa*; the Jain theory of formal logic; the Jain logic and the *nayas*; the doctrine of *syādvāda*; Śaṅkara and *syādvāda*; examination of Śaṅkara; the doctrine of unity in difference; the universe as a self-existent unit; theories of evolution; the Sāṅkhya philosophy; causation and compound evolution; god; soul; the *karma* phenomenology; churchainity and the law of *karma*; belief in rebirth; rebirth and *karma-śarīra*; *karma-śarīra* and *audarika-śarīra*; free-will and fatalism; will and individuality; causality in the moral world; classification of *karmas*; from metaphysics to ethics; the conceptions of virtue and vice; on *puṇya* and its fruitions; *pāpa*, vice or sin; *āsrava* or influx; *bandha* or bondage; *saṃvara* or stoppage; *nirjarā* or dissipation; *mokṣa* or emancipation; *guṇasthānas*; Jain church; Jain festivals; Jain places of pilgrimage; Jain literature; Jain art and architecture; and appendices.[100]

A.J. Montogomery's *Religions of the Past and Present* (London, 1918) contained a short but very useful addendum of Jainism by Franklin Edgerton. B.L. Garr's *Sāmāyika or a Way of Equanimity* (Arrah, 1918) dealt with the origin of the concept, its meaning and object, dissension of the subject from the ideal or internal (*niscai*) point of view, a succinct account of the *Āvaśyakasūtra*, blemishes (*doṣas*) to be avoided, the texts on Sāmāyika, how to perform it, the eleven *pratimās* and twelve vows. C.R. Jain's *What is Jainism* (Arrah, 1919) dealt with the ethics, philosophical background, mythology and rituals of the Jains, while his *Key to the Knowledge* (Arrah, 1919) was a study of creation, god, redemption, yoga, trinity, siddhāntas, the coming of messiah, reincarnation and other topics from a Jain viewpoint. His *Peep behind the Veil of Karmas* (Arrah, 1920) should also be mentioned in this connection. M. Bloomfield's *The Life and Stories of the Jain Saviour Pārśvanātha* (Baltimore, 1919) contained a first hand research on the non-canonical sources in which the legends of Pārśva were collected and interpreted from the vast Prākrit narrative literature and also from the Jain Purāṇas and other canonical works. B.C. Law's 'Influence of the Five Heretical Teachers on Jainism and Buddhism' (1919)[101] attempted to trace

[100]Two important articles of this period dealing with the date of Lord Mahāvīra should be mentioned in this connection one by Jarl Charpentier in *Ind. Ant.*, XLIII, 1914, 118–23, 125–33, 167–78, and the other by S.V. Venkateswara in *JRAS*, 1917, 122–80.

[101]*Journal and Proc. of the ASB*, XV, 123–36.

the origins of certain Buddhist and Jain concepts to the doctrines expounded by Pūraṇa Kassapa, Pakudha Kaccāyana, Ajita Kesakambali, Sañjaya Bilaṭṭhiputta and Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta. His *Historical Gleanings* (Calcutta, 1922) dealt with the interactions of Buddhism and Jainism, especially with reference to well known individuals belonging to the earlier creeds of both the sects. H. Warren's self explanatory *Jainism not Atheism* came out from Arrah in 1920.[102] P.C. Bagchi's 'Animistic Elements in Jainism'[103] dealt with the primitive ethical background of the doctrine of non-injury while his 'Primitive Elements of Jainism'[104] was an anthropological and linguistic approach to the philosophy, religious rites, superstitions and mythology of the Jains.

B.M. Barua's *A History of the Pre-Buddhist Indian Philosophy* (Calcutta, 1921) was a very significant contribution to the field of Jain studies. The first part of the chapter on Jainism in this work dealt with the background of the philosophy of Mahāvīra under such topics as aim and scope; review of modern studies in Jainism; lack of historical method; acknowledgement of debts to the Jain scholars; a general reflection on Indian life in the time of Mahāvīra and Buddha; the bearing of political history upon the progress of thought and development of language; uninterrupted growth of Sanskrit; the origins of pessimism; the problem of misery and other ethical problems. In the second part a short account of the life of Mahāvīra was given with special emphasis on how he developed his own philosophical and ethical points of view in agreement and contrast with those of his predecessors and contemporaries. In this connection he had taken into account the career of Pārśva and his teaching demonstrating especially in which sense Pārśva might be called the precursor of Mahāvīra. According to Barua, Kiriyam or Kriyāvāda was the original name of what was later known as Jainism and Nigantha was the name of an order which was originally represented by Pārśva who was a mere religious teacher in contrast with Mahāvīra who was a religious philosopher whose philosophic predecessor was Gosāla. The third part was a comparative study of Gosāla, Mahāvīra and Buddha in which light was thrown on Buddha's interpretation and criticism of pre-Jain and contemporary philosophers from the standpoint of his own ethics; the fundamental categories and maxim of Mahāvīra's ethics; modification of Buddha's interpretation of his predecessor's fundamental ethical thesis and of Mahāvīra's interpretation of pre-Jain philosophies; difference between the views of Mahāvīra and Buddha; and the correlation of Niyativāda and Kriyāvāda. In the fourth part the Jain metaphysics—the substances, the problems of knowledge, epistemology and logic—was treated and the transition from a biological to a psychological or from a physical to an ethical standpoint was highlighted. It was also suggested that Gosāla's determinism did not exclude the notion of the freedom of the will nor did Mahāvīra's dynamism altogether set aside the rule of fate.

[102]Cf. 'Atheism' (Jain), in *ERE*, II, 186–87; O. Pertold, 'The Idea of God in Jainism and Buddhism' in the *Proceedings of the Tenth Indian Science Congress*, Calcutta, 1924.

[103]*Proceedings of the ASB*, XVII, 1921.

[104]*Journal of the Dept. of Letters*, 1921, 349–64.

In A.B. Keith's *Indian Logic and Atomism* (Oxford, 1921) Jain logic was handled in connection with the doctrines of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas. The Jain legends as to the origin of the Vaiśeṣikas, the Jain theories of cognition and perception, Bhadrabāhu's ten-membered syllogism, the Jain attitude towards reality, symbolism of Jain mythology, Jain atomism and sound theory and the Jain attitude towards theism were discussed. Satis Chandra Vidyabhusana's *History of Indian Logic* (Calcutta, 1921)[105] dealt with the Jain logical works of Bhadrabāhu, Umāsvāmin, Siddhasena Divākara, Samantabhadra, Akalaṅka, Haribhadra, Guṇaratna and others.[106] The first volume of S.N. Dasgupta's *History of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1922) contained a very scholarly assessment of Jain philosophy under the following topics. The origin of Jainism; two sects of Jainism; the canonical and other literature of the Jains; some general characteristics of the Jains; life of Mahāvīra; the fundamental ideas of Jain ontology; the doctrine of relative pluralism (*anekāntavāda*); the doctrine of *nayas*; the doctrine of *syādvāda*; knowledge, its value for us; theory of perception; non-perception knowledge; knowledge as revelation; the *jīvas*; the *karma* theory; *karma*, *āsrava* and *nirjarā*; *pudgala*; *dharma*, *adharma*, *ākāśa*, *kāla* and *samaya*, Jain cosmography; Jain yoga; Jain atheism; and *mokṣa* or liberation. Almost all the

[105]Vidyabhusana's *History of the Medieval School of Indian Logic*, published in 1909, also dealt with the Jain logicians.

[106]Reference must also be made in this connection to the contribution of L. Suali who not only edited and translated into Italian numerous Jain philosophical treatises but also made a thought provoking evaluation of Jain philosophy in his *Introduzione alla Studio della Filosofia Indiana*, Pavia, 1913.

aspects mentioned above were treated by S. Radhakrishnan in the first volume of his *Indian Philosophy* (London, 1927) under the title 'Pluralistic Realism of the Jains'. But while Dasgupta's study was mainly historical in nature seeking to explain various trends in an historical perspective, Radhakrishnan's study was basically interpretative. The following topics were discussed in his work: Jainism; life of Vardhamāna; division between the Śvetāmbaras and the Digambaras; Jain literature; relation to Buddhism, Sāṅkhya, logic; five kinds of knowledge; *nayas* and their divisions; *saptavibhaṅgī*; criticism of the Jain theory of knowledge; its monistic implications; psychological views; soul; body and mind; metaphysics, substance and quality; *jīva* and *ajīva*; *dharma* and *adharma*; time; matter; atomic theory; *karma*; *leśyās*; *jīva* and their kinds; ethics; human freedom; ethics of Buddhism and Jainism compared, caste, *saṅgha*; attitude towards God; religion; *nirvāṇa*; critical estimate of Jain philosophy. C. Krause's *An Introduction to Jain Ethics* (Bhavnagar, 1929) and *Heritage of the Last Arhat* (Bhavnagar, 1930) dealt with the fundamental principles of Jainism, aspects of Jain philosophy, the Jain way to salvation, the *pratimās* or the stages of householder's life and other features associated with Jain concept of morality. According to Krause, "Jainism does not torpify its followers by the terrors of *karma*, nor does it make them languish in unhealthy, effeminate fatalism, as many people think all Oriental religions do; but on the contrary, it trains the individual to become a true hero on the battlefield of self-conquest."

The combined form of M.S. Ramaswami Ayyangar's 'South Indian Jainism' and B. Seshagiri Rao's 'Andhra-Karnataka Jainism' was published under the title *Studies in South Indian Jainism* (Madras, 1922).[107] The former was based mainly on literary materials in which it was stated that Jainism in the Tamil region had a vigorous survival till the seventh century A.D., that its antiquity might be traced to the pre-Mauryan times and that its decline was due to the rise of Śaiva Nāyanārs, the conversion of the Pāṇḍya and Pallava kings to other creeds and the persecution which the Jains had to face in the hands

[107]Reprinted in 1980 in two separate volumes. E. Hultzsch's 'Die Digambaras von Mysore' in *ZDMG*, LXVIII, 1914, 695–700 should be mentioned in connection with southern Jainism. Cf. S.K. Aiyangar, *Some Contribution of South India to Indian Culture*, Calcutta, 1923; K.P. Jain, 'The Antiquity of Jainism in South India in Indian Culture', IV, 512–16; S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, 'Jainism in South India' in *Atmananda Centenary Commemoration Volume*, 1936; B.V. Krishna Rao, 'Jainism in Andhradeśa' in *JAHRS*, XII, 185–96.

of the Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas. It contained the following chapters: Early History of the Jain Sect; Jain Migration to the South; Spread of Jainism in the Tamil Land; Period of the Nāyanārs and the Āḻvārs; Modern Jainism; Jains in Tamil Literature and the Sangama Age. The latter contained three elaborate chapters: The Evidence of Tradition; Epigraphia Jainica; and Jainism in Andhra-Karnataka Literary Tradition. The first volume of the *Cambridge History of India* (Cambridge, 1922) contained a chapter on Jainism written by Jarl Charpentier under the title 'The History of the Jains', the contents of which were as follows: Jainism, its relation to Brahmanism and Buddhism; the Tīrthaṅkaras or prophets; Pārśva and Mahāvīra; Mahāvīra's rivals—Gośāla and Jamāli; the Jain Church after the death of Mahāvīra; the great schism; Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras; settlements in western India; organisation of the religious and lay communities; and the blanks in Jain ecclesiastical history.[108] M.B. Jhavery's *Historical Facts about Jainism* (Bombay, 1925) was basically intended to remove certain misconceptions about Jainism current among the scholars and historians, as well as among the common people. It dealt with the functional role of Jainism even in the present day, various Jain organisations and benevolent institutions, the contribution of the Jains to public welfare and many allied aspects. H.V. Glasenapp's *Der Jainismus: eine indische Erlösungsreligion* (Berlin, 1925) was a lucid exposition of the history and doctrines of the Jains, the importance of which has not been minimised even today.[109] H. Bhattacharyya's *Divinity in Jainism* (Madras, 1925) attempted to interpret the basic conception of the Jinas or the Tīrthaṅkaras and various Śāsanadevatās and other categories of deities, constituting the Jain pantheon, and define their reciprocal relation. He tried to show that although in the true sense Jainism does not attribute the creation of universe to God, it cannot be labelled as atheistic, because it believes in numerous gods and religious practices associated with them. But the Jain gods are in reality emancipated souls or idealised beings. C.R. Jain's *Jain Law* (Madras, 1926) was the second major work on this topic after the work of J.L. Jaini mentioned above.[110]

[108]From Cambridge another work came out in 1922. A.J. Sunavala's *Vijaya Dharma Suri: His Life and Work* with a prefatory note by F.W. Thomas.

[109]Gujarati translation, N.J. Patel, Bhavnagar, 1930.

[110]Among other works of C.R. Jain mention should be made of *Sannyāsa Dharma*, Delhi, 1926; *Key of Knowledge*, Allahabad, 1928; *Practical Dharma*, Allahabad, 1929;

A. Guerinot's *La religion djaina* (Paris, 1926) was a comprehensive account of the history and doctrines of the Jains, and most reliable for the author's lifelong association with the study of Jainism.[111] In A.C. Sen's *School and Sects in Jain Literature* (Calcutta, 1931) different philosophical schools of the time of Mahāvīra—as many as 363 arranged in four groups—and the sects like those of the Ājīvikas were treated along with the various schisms which had taken place from time to time in the history of Jainism and contributed to the rise of various sects and subsects on the basis of literary materials.[112] C.J. Shah's *Jainism in North India*, 800 BC-AD 526 (London, 1932) was a purely historical study based on literary and epigraphic sources which started with a critical assessment of the historicity of the earlier Tīrthaṅkaras, threw light on the life and ministry of Mahāvīra and the history of Jain church after his demise and gave a detailed account of the expansion of Jainism in Mathura, Ujjayinī and other parts of northern India.[113] Walther Schubring's *Die Lehre der Jainas*[114] was a major contribution to the study of Jainism which was first published in 1934 in the Grundriss series. Its first chapter contained a short history of Jain research. The second—An Historical Sketch of Jainism—had the following topics: Heroic legends; Pāsa; Mahāvīra, Gosāla, Goyāma and Suhamma; Early Jain Church; Jina Statues; Schism; Early Literature; Digambaras; Śvetāmbaras; Sthānakavāsī; and other Sects. The third was on the Canon dealing respectively with the Puvvas, Sections, Commentaries, Aṅgas, Uvaṅgas, Paiṇṇas, Cheyasuttas, Nandi and Anuogadārā, Mūlasuttas and Aṅgabahiras. The fourth—Cos-

Ṛṣabhadeva: The Founder of Jainism, Allahabad, 1929; *Jain Penance*, Allahabad, 1930; *Householder's Dharma*, Bijnore, 1931; *Jain Culture*, Bijnore, 1934; *Change of Heart*, Delhi, 1939; J.L. Jaini's *Bright Ones in Jainism* was published in 1926 from Allahabad.

[111]Critically reviewed by C. Krause in *ZDMG*, LXXXIV, 192–202; Frauwallner in *Wiener Zeitschrift*, XXXVI, 336 ff.

[112]The Śvetāmbara-Digambara split was discussed in most historical works on Jainism. See especially H. Jacobi's 'Digambaras' in *ERE*, IV, 704 and S. Stevenson's 'Svetambara Sects' in *ERE*, XII, 124; also K.P. Jain, 'Svetambara and Digambara Sects' in *Ind. Ant.*, LIX, 151–54; *Studies in Indology presented to P.V. Kane*, 1941, 228–37; P.C. Nahar in *Ind. Ant.*, LVIII, 167–68; LXI, 121–26.

[113]Cf. Bool Chand, 'Jainism in Kaliṅga Deśa' in *Ācārya Dhruva Smāraka Grantha*, 87–100; P.L. Paul, 'Jainism in Bengal' in *Indian Culture*, III, 524–30; L.A. Phaltane, 'Light on Ancient Jain History' in *Jain Gazette*, XXVIII, 186–90; K.P. Jain, 'Jainism under Muslim Rule' in *New Indian Antiquary*, I, 516–21.

[114]Eng. trans. by Wolfgang Beurlen, *The Doctrine of the Jainas*, Delhi, 1962.

mology-contained Fundamental Facts; Units; Atom; Bodies; Physiology; Soul; Cognition; *naya*; *nikkeva*; *sīyā*; *kevala*-Cognition; Spiritual Function; *karman*; Binding; Realisation; Kinds of *karman*; Ejection; Life; Kinds concluded and Reincarnation. The fifth—Cosmography—described the world and its Shape, Beings, Lower World, Centre World, Jambuddiva periods, Oceans and Ring-continents, Gods and Stars, Upper World and its gods, and Isīpabbhārā. The sixth chapter—Renunciation—dealt with the community of the monks, their ranks, outfits, daily life, study, begging tour, asceticism, confession and atonement, lay folk and death. The last chapter under the title Victory dealt with such topics as Similis, Human character, Influence (*aṇhaya*) and Stoppage (*saṃvara*), Lay Vows, Monastic Vows, Control, Ethics, Reflections, Resistance, Right Conduct, Asceticism, Meditation, Miracles and Magic, Conditions of *karma*, *guṇaṭṭhāna* and *sehi*, Annihilation, Kevalin and Siddha. B.C. Law's *Mahāvīra: His Life and Teachings* (London, 1937) was based on Prākrit and Pali sources. Law, however, refused to hold that the 22 Tīrthaṅkaras who preceded Pārśva and Mahāvīra were historical persons. B.A. Saletore's *Medieval Jainism with Special Reference to the Vijayanagara Empire* (Bombay, 1938) dealt with Jainism from a non-religious standpoint. The conspicuous part played by all sections of the peoples—kings, feudatories, nobles, priests, citizens and women—was described with the aid of historical records. It attempted to establish the connecting link in the history of the pre-Vijayanagara and Vijayanagara Jainism with the great Vijayanagara House. And so far as the religion itself was concerned, the author noted that far from being a bundle of metaphysical beliefs, it was a faith that added a large measure to the material prosperity of the land. The book contained the following chapters: Preliminary Remarks; Royal Benevolence; Princely Patronage; Jain Men of Action; Women as Defenders of the Faith; Popular Support; Critical Times; Vijayanagara's Pledge; State Aid to Jainism; Jainism in the Provincial Courts; Anekāntavāda in the Empire; and Jaina Celebrities in the Vijayanagara Empire.

Saletore's work marked a significant advancement in the field of the study of south Indian Jainism when viewed against the backdrop of the earlier studies of Ramaswami Ayyangar and Seshagiri Rao. Studies on south Indian Jainism were further facilitated with the publication of S.R. Sharma's *Jainism and Karnataka Culture* (Dharwar, 1940) and A. Chakravarti's *Jain Literature in Tamil*

(Arrah, 19141).[115] K.P. Jain's *Some Historical Jain Kings and Heroes* (Delhi, 1941) and B.C. Law's *India as Depicted in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism* (London, 1941) were important contributions to the study of the socio-political life on the basis of the Jain sources. D.C. Dasgupta's *Jain System of Education* (Calcutta, 1942) dealt with various institutions, foundations, monastic education, teacher-student relationship, curriculum for study, method of teaching, libraries or *bhāṇḍāras* and other allied features. H.V. Glasenapp's *Karma in Jaina Philosophy* (Bombay, 1942), which was translated into English by B. Fifford, contained a lucid exposition of the Jain definition of *karma*, its eight main divisions and 148 subdivisions, its *ghātiā* and *aghātiyā* forms, *kārmic*-matter and *kārmic*-body, the process of the influx of *karma*, the methods of the stoppage of the influx and of purging off the stored *karmas* leading to *mokṣa* or salvation. We have already had the occasion to refer to H.R. Kapadia's *History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas* (Bombay, 1941). His next work *Jain Religion and Literature* (Lahore, 1944) also proved to be of importance in the field of Jain studies. M.B. Jhaveri's *Comparative and Critical Study of the Mantraśāstra* (Ahmedabad, 1944) was an exceptional work because it was devoted to the study of Jain Tantrism. Needless to say that Tantrism in the form of the Mother Goddess cult, magical rites like the *ṣaṭ-karmas*, curative spells, incantations efficacy of *mantra* etc., are also met with in Jainism. U.P. Shah's 'A Peep into the Early History of Tantra in Jain Literature' published in the *Bhārata Kaumudī*, II (Allahabad, 1947) should also be mentioned in this connection. Satkari Mookherjee's *Jain Philosophy of Non-Absolutism* (Calcutta, 1944) was a critical study of the Anekāntavāda, the pluralistic realism, which brought a qualitative change in the Jain philosophical studies. Hermann Jacobi's stray articles on different aspects of Jainism were collected and edited by Jina Vijaya Muni and these were published under the title *Studies in Jainism* in 1946 from Ahmedabad. Among other important publications of the 1940s Beni Prasad's *World Problems and Jain Ethics* (Lahore, 1945), Bool Chand's *Jain Cultural Studies* (Benares, 1946) and *Lord Mahāvīra: A Study in Historical Perspective* (Benares, 1948), J.C. Jain's *Life in Ancient India as Depicted*

[115]For informations on Jainism in Karnataka see also E.P. Rice, *History of Kanarese Literature*, London, 1921; S. Srikantha Sastri, *Sources of the Karnataka History*, Mysore, 1940; R. Narasimhacharya, *History of the Kannada Literature*, Mysore, 1940; R.S. Mugali, *The Heritage of Karnataka*, Bangalore, 1946.

in the Jain Canons (Bombay, 1947) and K.K. Handiqui's *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture* (Sholapur, 1949) deserve special mention. J.C. Jain's *Life in Ancient India* was not directly connected with the study of religion, but the varied informations on social life as were collected and arranged subjectwise under numerous sub-headings from the printed texts and unpublished manuscripts made it so valuable for the purpose of social studies that its reference was hardly omitted in any work of ancient Indian social history.

In view of what we have seen above it is clear that, apart from some European and non-Jain Indian scholars, it was the enthusiastic Jain intelligentsia that took the leading part in the revival and renovation of the Jain studies in a modern sense. They also felt the need of making the members of their community acquainted with the basic principles of their creed, its manners, customs and rituals, and this led them to write books on Jainism in Indian languages. As a result, a good number books were published in Hindi, Gujarati, Marathi, Kannada and even in Bengali. Some of the works published in the regional languages were very serious and thought-provoking, such as Sukhlalji Sanghvi's *Jaina Saṃskṛti Kā Hṛdaya* which was regarded as a fundamental work indispensable for a clear understanding of the essential spirit of Jainism. So far as the Hindi works were concerned, many of them pertained to the study of Jain epigraphs,[116] literature,[117] historical biography,[118] dynastic history,[119] historical sketch,[120] religious tenets,[121] holy places,[122] sociological assessment,[123] sacraments,[124] etc. Besides

[116]P.C. Nahar, *Jaina Lekha Saṃgraha*, 3 vols., Calcutta, 1928–29; K.P. Jain, *Prācīna Jaina Lekha Saṃgraha*, Wardha, 1926; H.L. Jain, *Jaina Śilālekha Saṃgraha*, Bombay, 1928; S.C. Divakara, *Jaina Śāsana*, Benares, 1945; etc.

[117]Nathuram Premi, *Jaina Sāhitya aur Itihās*, Bombay, 1942; Jinavijaya, *Jaina Pustaka Praśasti Saṃgraha*, Bombay, 1943; K.P. Jain, *Hindi Jaina Sāhitya kā Saṃkṣipta Itihās*, Benares, 1947.

[118]Cf. K.P. Jain, *Bhagavān Mahāvīra*, Surat, 1924; etc.

[119]Cf. Ramlalji, *Mahājana Vaṃśa Muktāvalī*, Bombay, 1910; etc.

[120]Cf. K.P. Jain, *Saṃkṣipta Jaina Itihās*, Surat, 1934; H.L. Jain, *Jaina Itihās kī Pūrva Pīṭhikā aur Hamārā Abhyutthān*, Bombay, 1939; etc.

[121]Cf. Kailash Chandra, *Jaina Dharma*, Benares, 1946.

[122]K.P. Jain, *Jaina Tīrtha aur Unkī Yātrā*, Delhi, 1946.

[123]K.P. Jain, *Jaina Jāti kā Hrāsa aur Unnati ke Upāya*, Aliganj, 1923.

[124]Anon, *Śrī Jaina Saṃskāra Vidhi*, Bombay, 1907; Sripalchandraji, *Jaina Sampradāya Śikṣā*, Benares, 1910; J.K. Mukhtyar, *Jinapūjādhikāramīmāṃsā*, Bombay, 1913;

there were also numerous works on the history, custom and rituals of various Jain sects and castes under organisational patronage.[125] A good number of books were written on the marriage system and the ideals of Jain marriage.[126] N.D. Yajnika wrote on Jain marriage in Gujarati (1904).[127] Among other Jain works in Gujarati mention may be made of *Jaina Śvetāmbara Directory* (Bombay, 1909), *Śrī Saurāṣṭra Visa Śrimālina Jñatino Dharo* (Bombay, 1910), C.M. Dalal's *Poravāḍa Vaṇikona Itihāsa* (Bombay, 1922), *Vidhipakṣa (Añcala) Gacchiya Mhoti Paṭṭavali* (Ahmedabad, 1928), *Akhila Bhāratavarṣīya Śrī Jaina Muni Sammelana Nirṇaya* (Ahmedabad, 1934), etc. The most outstanding publication in Gujarati was M.D. Desai's *Jaina Sāhityāno Saṃkṣipta Itihās* (A Short History of Jain Literature, Bombay, 1933).[128] In Marathi most works were on Jain castes and customs. P.L. Vaidya's *Jaina Dharmāṇi Vāṅmaya* (Nagpur, 1948) was, however, an important work on Jain religion and literature. The Kannada classics were themselves important sources of Jain history. The texts which were edited till the fifties were Aggala's *Candraprabhā-purāṇam* (ed. S.G. Narasimhachar and M.A. Ramanuja Iyangar, Mysore, 1901), Janna's *Anantanātha-Purāṇam* (ed. M.A. Ramanuja Iyangar, Mysore, 1912), Nayasena's *Dharmāmṛta* (ed. R. Shamasastry, Mysore, 1924), Ponna's *Śāntipurāṇam* (ed. A. Venkatarao and H. Sesha Iyangar, Madras, 1929), Guṇavarma II's *Puṣpadanta Purāṇam* (ed. A. Venkata Rao and H. Sesha Iyangar, Mysore, 1933), Nāgavarma's *Kāvyavalokana* (ed. H.R. Ramaswamy Iyangar, Mysore, 1939), Karṇapārya's *Neminātha Purāṇam* (ed. H. Sesha Iyangar, Madras, 1940), and Hastimalli's *Pūrvapurāṇam* (ed.

Shastri, *Ṣoḍaśa Saṃskāra*, Calcutta, 1924; Sital Prasad, *Grhasthadharma*, Bombay, 1930; Sphulinga, *Dassā Pūjādhikāra Vicāra*, Jabalpur, 1937.

[125]Among works of this category mention may be made of *Osavāla Jāti kā Itihās* (Osavala History Publishing House) Bhanpura, 1934; Jñāna Sundarji, *Jaina Jāti Mahodaya*, Phalodhi, 1929; M.G. Kothari, *Jāti, Varṇa aur Vivāha*, Palitana, 1933; B.L. Jain, *Agravāla Itihās*, Barabanki; etc. Such works are also frequent in Gujarati and Marathi.

[126]Phattelalji, *Jaina Vivāha Paddhati*, Bombay, 1901; J.N. Mukhtyar, *Vivāha ka Uddeśya*, Bombay, 1916; *Vivāha Kṣetra Prakāśa*, Delhi, 1925; Savyasachi, *Jaina Dharma aur Vidhavā Vivāha*, Delhi, 1931; P.D. Jain, *Vijātiya Vivāha Mimāṃsā*, Calcutta, 1934; B.T. Kala, *Jaina Vivāha Paddhati aur Lokācāra*, Mandangaon, 1940.

[127]*Jaina Vivāha Vidhi*, Bhavnagar, 1904.

[128]His work on Jain poets, *Jaina Gurjara Kavio* was published from Bombay in 1926. A.P. Shah and G.B. Chowdhary's *Jain Sāhitya kā Bṛhad Itihās*, several vols., 1961 ff; J.C. Jain's *Prākrit Sāhitya kā Itihās*, 1961, etc. should be mentioned on this connection.

K.G. Kundnagar, Kolhapur, 1943). Other texts and works on Jainism in Kannada will be mentioned later.

Bool Chand's *Jainism in Indian History* (Varanasi, 1951) was basically a historical sketch with emphasis on its functional role in different walks of Indian life through the ages. Two works on Jain philosophy published during the fifties deserved special mention: Nathmal Tatiā's *Studies in Jain Philosophy* (Varanasi, 1951) and M.L. Mehta's *Outlines of Jain Philosophy* (Bangalore, 1954). Charlotte Krause's *Ancient Jaina Hymns*, brought out in the Scindia Oriental Series (Ujjain, 1952), was a well edited inspiring collection with great academic utility sufficiently capable of evoking interest in Jainism among the non-Jain readers. A good number of Jain regional history were published in the 1950s. Among them C.B. Sheth's *Jainism in Gujarat* (Bombay, 1953), P.C. Raychaudhuri's *Jainism in Bihar* (Patna, 1956), P.B. Desai's *Jainism in South India* (Sholapur, 1957) and L.N. Sahu's (Hindi) *Orissa men Jain Dharma* (Aligarh, 1959) deserve special mention. S.B. Deo's *History of Jain Monachism from Inscriptions and Literature* (Poona, 1956) was the comprehensive work on this subject. P.C. Samsukha's *Lord Mahāvīra: His Life and Doctrine* (Calcutta, 1957) was also an expository work. V.A. Sangave's *Jaina Community: A Social Survey* (Bombay, 1959) brought a new dimension in the field of Jain studies. Primarily based on extensive field-study, rather the first of its kind, the varied contents of this work should be noted in greater detail. The first chapter of this work dealt with the Jain population in regard to general distribution, age distribution, sex composition, fertility and longevity, proportion of married, unmarried and widowed persons, proportion of literacy in the community and nineteen appendices containing statements, graphs and diagrams pertaining to various aspects of population study done from a strictly sociological point of view. The second chapter dealt with the religious divisions in the Jain community in which light was thrown on early history of the Jain religion, the great schism, the two main sects, the major and minor subsects, rise of sections and subsections and attempts of reconciliation. The third was on social divisions dealing with caste, class and social stratifications with eleven appendices on various Jain castes, subcastes, *gotras* and dynasties. The fourth dealt with marriage, its object, normality, forms, qualification of parties to the union, age, choice of partners, preliminaries and ceremonies, consummation, polygyny, dissolution of wedlock and the

position of women. The fifth was on Jain ethics and miscellaneous customs and manners. Besides an introductory, it dealt with the meaning of Jainism, fundamental principles of Jainism, philosophy, the theory of *karma*, *mokṣamārga* or way to salvation, ethics, criticism of Jain ethics, worship, festivals and fasts, superstitions, *saṃskāras*, *tirthakṣetras* or places of pilgrimage, occupations and professions, food and drink, dress and ornaments, language and literature and Jain institutions. The sixth under the title 'The Working Model,' dealt with names and surnames, occupations and professions, sects and subsects, *gotra*, *saṅgha*, *gaṇa*, *gaccha* and *śākhā*, castes and subcastes, population and distribution of castes, interrelations of castes, hierarchical organisation of castes, caste *panchayatas*, caste feasts, Jain and Hindu castes, rules of endogamy and exogamy, castes and charitable institutions, choice of occupations, caste and education, religious sanction to castes, institution of Bhaṭṭāraka, origin of castes, Jains in ascetic stage, religious disabilities, widow remarriage, polygyny, number of criminals, castes and social reform, castes and temples, family deity, migration of families, distinguished personalities in families, family organisation, inter-marriages, Jain festivals, Jain rites, Jain *saṃskāras*, Jain language, sacred thread, Jain priests, Jain fasts, death ceremonies, religious education, worship of Hindu deities, problem of widows and Jain culture. The seventh under the title Retrospect dealt with the historical background, achievements of the Jains, reasons for the survival of the Jains, causes of decline of Jainism and present problems and the way out. A copy of the Questionnaire which was extensively distributed for the collection of data was also incorporated in the volume.

S.B. Deo's *Jain Monastic Jurisprudence* (Benares, 1960) was undoubtedly more critical and historical in nature than the earlier works on Jain law. In his earlier work (1956) Deo dealt with the origin, development and functions of the Jain monastic institutions in an historical perspective on the basis of literature and inscription, and the present work should be regarded as its supplement. The Jain doctrines offer a unique scope to the study of human mind and its activities. In fact the Jain concept of *karma* as an extraneous material principle soiling the Jīva through its influx or *āsrava* reminds one of the stimulus-response theory, of the fact that the pure and stainless human mind is conditioned by the external forces of *karma* matters and that what we call mental

action or reaction is the essential feature of mind itself have a close bearing on modern psychological theories. Although the study of Jain psychology was initiated by Dasgupta and Radhakrishnan, it was in T.G. Kalaghatagi's *Some Problems in Jain Psychology* (Dharwar, 1961) a fuller exposition on this subject along with its technical intricacies was presented. One of the major works published from Calcutta in 1961 was Sukhlalji Sanghvi's *Advanced Studies in Indian Logic and Metaphysics* which was the English rendering of the Introduction and Philosophical Notes of his celebrated edition of Hemacandra's *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* which was published in 1939 in the Singhi Jaina Granthamālā. Since Sukhlalji was against writing anything except in Gujarati and Hindi, such an important contribution to Indian philosophy was hitherto unavailable to the English knowing readers. The Introduction was translated into English by Indukala Jhaveri, while the philosophical notes by K.K. Dikshit who selected and arranged them in such a manner under the advice and guidance of Sukhlalji as could serve the purpose of an independent book on Indian philosophy. The English title was suggested by Sukhlalji himself. The Introduction comprised the following chapters. The nature of Jain standpoint; the unchanging character of Jain standpoint; the sphere of application of an organ of knowledge; the total extent of the knowable sphere; and *anekāntavāda*—the principal Jain contribution to Indian logic. The first chapter of the Philosophical Notes entitled 'On Problems of Knowledge in General' dealt with the following aspects. Is cognition self-revelatory or not-self-revelatory? The logical tradition of defining *pramāṇa*; validity of cognition—Is it intrinsic or extrinsic the effect of a *pramāṇa*; Is memory a *pramāṇa*? Is continuous cognition a *pramāṇa*? Is recognition a *pramāṇa*? The Jain classification of knowledge. The second 'On Problems of Perception' had the following. The nature of perception in general; the nature of indeterminate perception; the nature of sense-organs; the nature of *manas*; the nature of *ātman* and the mode of its revelation; the Buddhist definition of perception; the Mīmāṃsā definition of perception; and the Sāṅkhya definition of perception. The third, 'On Problems of Inference' dealt with the nature of inference and the history of its treatment in Indian logic; whether *tarka* is a *pramāṇa*; the nature of *vyāpti*; the number and steps in an inference-for-others; the aspects of the nature of a probans; the types of probans; whether effect alone or cause also is a proper probans and some

allied problems; the nature of *pakṣa*; the nature of *dṛṣṭānta*; the nature of pseudo-probans; and the nature of pseudo-*dṛṣṭānta*. The fourth, 'On Metaphysical Problems' dealt with the object of a *pramāṇa*; *dravya*, *guṇa* and *paryāya*; and the criterion of reality. A translation of Hemacandra's *Pramāṇamīmāṃsā* was made by Satkari Mookherjee and Nathmal Tatia under the title *Critique of Organ of Knowledge* which was published by the Jain Cultural Research Society, Benares.

Jainism like all other religious systems of ancient India insists on yoga as the means of disciplining of the body and mind, and consequently of salvation. This aspect was touched by most authors. R.P. Chanda and U.P. Shah went to the extent of identifying a Mohenjo-daro statuette with the prototype of a Jain yogi; but a comprehensive survey of the yogic theories and practices as found in the Jain texts and the Jain images was made in R. William's *Jaina Yoga* (London, 1963). S.C. Murthy's *Jain Vestigers in Andhra* (Hyderabad, 1963) and K.P. Jain's *Jainism in Rajasthan* (Sholapur, 1963) were important factual publications. Upendra Thakur's *Studies in Jainism and Buddhism in Mithila* (Varanasi, 1964) contained two chapters on Jainism. The first under the title Rise and Growth of Jainism, besides its introductory, dealt with Vaiśālī, the birth-place of Mahāvīra, contemporary socio-religious condition, the age of logical disputation, an historical survey of royal patronage of Jainism and Jain antiquities from the Mithila region. The second dealt with the last phase of Jainism in Mithila. J.P. Jain's *The Jaina Source of the History of Ancient India* (Delhi, 1964) was an evaluation of the historical worth of the Jain sources of Indian history during the epoch-making millennium of 100 BC to AD 900. In this book the author had fixed the dates of the Mahāvīra Era, the Earlier Śaka Era and the Śaka Era, as well as the dates of important Jain authors and literary works, and thus cleared much of the fog that made Indian chronology, both political and cultural. H. Bhattacharyya's *The Jain Prayer* (Calcutta, 1964) was an interpretative exposition of the Jain approach to divinity while J.C. Sikdar's *Studies in the Bhagavatī Sūtra* (Muzaffarpur, 1964) was a critical analysis of a significant work of the Aṅga category revealing its linguistic, historical, religious and philosophical implications. J.C. Jain's Hindi work *Jain Āgam Sāhitya me Bhāratīya Samāj* (Varanasi, 1965) was mostly based on his early English work on the social life of ancient India as found in the Jain canonical literature.

K.C. Sogani's *Ethical Doctrines of Jainism* (Sholapur, 1967) and D. Bhargava's *Jain Ethics* (Delhi, 1968) were both systematic studies of the ethical principles of Jainism in which the rationale of Jain ethics was explained in terms of the other Indian systems as well. M.L. Mehta's *Jain Culture* (Varanasi, 1969) presented a complete picture of various aspects of Jainism, its functional role in different walks of Indian life and its contribution to the development of Indian civilisation with emphasis on the special Jain viewpoint and approach testifying its distinctiveness.

Ratna Shriyan's *A Critical Study of the Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta* (Ahmedabad, 1970) was a fundamental contribution to the study of native and rare words found in this and other Apabhraṃśa works of Puṣpadanta. M.L. Mehta and K.R. Chandra's *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names* (2 vols., Ahmedabad, 1970–72), done in imitation of Malalasekera's work on Pali proper names was also an important contribution. J.C. Jain's Hindi work *Prākrit Jaina Kathā Sāhitya* (Ahmedabad, 1971) was a study of Jain narrative literature which formed the nucleus of his subsequent bigger work in English to be dealt with later. Historical and ethnic roots of Jainism were studied by N.R. Guseva whose *Jainism* was translated from Russian by Y.S. Redkar (Bombay, 1971). K.K. Dikshit's *Jain Ontology* (Ahmedabad, 1971) masterly dealt with the Jain views on the questions concerning the origin, inner nature and purpose of the universe, its substance and quality, possibilities and realities, with a novelty in approach. B.C. Jain's *Jainism in Buddhist Literature* (Nagpur, 1972) began with the historical background of Jainism with emphasis on the antiquity of the Śramaṇa cult, Jainism and its literature and Buddhism and its literature. Then on the suggestivity of the Buddhist sources and details from the Jain sources it dealt with Jain philosophy, ethics and monachism. Epistemology was treated in two sections under the titles *pratyakṣa-pramāṇa* and *parokṣa-pramāṇa* and Anekāntavāda under the sections dealing respectively with the nature of reality, theory of Nayavāda and theory of Syādvāda. A good number of Jain texts were published in the seventies by the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad. Prominent among them were *Neminādhacariu* (ed. in two parts, M.C. Modi and H.C. Bhayani, 1970–71), *Adhyātmavindu* (Mitranandavijaya and N.J. Shah, 1972), *Sanatkumāracaria* (H.C. Bhayani and M.C. Modi, 1974), etc.

R.B. Prasad Singh's *Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka* (Delhi, 1973) dealt with the importance of the study of Karnataka Jainism, its sources, idol worship and Tantrism among the Karnataka Jains, their religious rituals and practices and the origin and development of Jain monachism in Karnataka. Besides a detailed analysis of literary and epigraphic sources the work provided a fresh insight into the subject. At the same time the social, economic and organisational aspects of Jainism were adequately studied. It should be mentioned in this connection that so far as the Karnataka Jainism is concerned there is no dearth of source materials, both archaeological and literary.[129] We have already had the occasion to refer to the Kannada classics edited and published till 1950. Among subsequent publications mention may be made of Ācaṇṇa's *Vardhamāna-purāṇam* (ed. Mariyappa Bhatta, Madras, 1952), Śāntinātha's *Sukumāracarita* (ed. T.S. Shamrao and D.L. Narasimhachar, Shimoga, 1954), Bandhuvarma's *Jīvasambodhana* (ed. H. Sesha Iyangar, Madras, 1955), Pārśvapaṇita's *Pārśvanātha-purāṇam* (ed. S. Bommarasa Pandita, Mysore, 1956), Ranna's Ajitanāthapurāṇatilakam (ed. D. Javaregauda and H. Devirappa, Mysore, 1959), Nemicandra's *Neminātha-purāṇam* (ed. B.S. Kulkarni, Dharwad, 1968) Śivakotyācārya's *Vaddārādhana* (ed. D.L. Narasimhachar, Mysore, 1972), Bandhuvarma's *Harivaṃśābhyudaya* (ed. B.S. Sannaya, Mysore, 1974), Nāgavarma II's *Vardhamāna-purāṇam* (ed. B.S. Sennaya, Mysore, 1974), Nāgacandra's *Mallinātha-purāṇam*, (ed. B.B. Hendi, Dharwar, 1974), Bāhubali's *Dharmanātha-purāṇam* (ed. N. Basavaradhya, Mysore, 1975), Cāvuṇḍarāya's *Triṣaṣṭilakṣaṇa-mahāpurāṇam* (ed. B.S. Kulkarni, Dharwar, 1975), Nāgacandra's *Rāmacandra-carita-purāṇam* (ed. R.C. Hiremath, New Delhi, 1975), Pampa's *Ādipurāṇam* (ed. L. Basavaraju, Mysore, 1976), Mahābala's *Neminātha-purāṇam* (ed. B.S. Sannaya, Mysore, 1977) and Mangarasa's *Nemijinešasaṅgati* (ed. B.B. Mahishawadi, Dharwar, 1979). Works on Kannada literature also throw light on Jainism in Karnataka.[130] Specific works on Jainism were also made in Kannada.[131]

[129]For archaeological sources see *Epigraphica Karnatica*, ed. by Lewis Rice, 12 vols., 1886–1904. Of these volumes, vol. II was entirely devoted to Śravaṇa Belgola, which was subsequently revised, enlarged and edited by R. Narasimhachar (1923) and again in 1973 with an addition of 73 records by the Institute of Kannada Studies, University of Mysore. The *Archaeological Survey of Mysore: Annual Reports*, (Mysore Archaeological Series, 1886 ff.) for the year's 1906–09 (vol. II), 1910 (vol. III) and 1912 (vol. IV) were revised under the title *A Study* by S. Settar and published by the Dept. of History and Archaeology, Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1976. There are also some Kannada works dealing with Jain inscriptions: M. Cidanandamurti, *Kannaḍa Śāsanagaḷa Saṃskṛtika Adhyayana*, Mysore, 1966; M.M. Kalaburgi Śāsana Vyāsanga, Dharwar, 1974; *Dharwad Talukina Śāsanagalu*, Dharwar, 1976; etc.

R.C. Dwivedi's edition of a volume entitled *Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture* (Varanasi, 1973) was a collection of papers on various aspects of Jainism presented at a seminar held by the department of Sanskrit in the Udaipur University. The papers were on contribution to culture; contribution to heritage evolution of *Sanatkumāra-carita*; Apabhraṃśa passages in the pre-tenth century Śvetāmbara Prākrit Sanskrit works; contribution to poetics; contribution to Sanskrit Alaṃkāra; contribution to poetry; contribution of Apabhraṃśa to Indian languages; contribution of Prākrit and Apabhraṃśa to modern Indo-Aryan languages; *Mahāparājayī:* A Jain allegorical play; contribution to South Indian literature; Ahimsā of Lord Mahāvīra (there were five papers on Ahiṃsā); Syādvāda; contribution to Indian philosophy; Jain concept of space; Jain contribution to the development of Buddhism; concept of Jain mysticism; Jain ethical theories; defining the *pramāṇa*; ancient Jain art of Madhya Pradesh; Jain school of mathematics; concept of energy in Jain literature; contribution of Jainism to chemical knowledge, Jainism in Karnataka, Jain writers and the social cultural history of medieval Rajasthan; Jainism in Mithila; Jain castes and their *gotras* in Rajasthan; and an account of trade and shipping in Prākrit literature. These were all written by eminent scholars of Jainism. Muni Uttam Kamal Jain's *Jaina Sects and Schools* (Delhi, 1975) was an important addition to Jain historical works in which an attempt was made to systematise the traditions in regard to various splits within the Jain church and the emergence of different sects and schools which were all independently treated with reference to the legends or facts of their origins, their doctrinal and ritualistic peculiarities, list of teachers, distributions and allied topics. Madhu Sen's *Cultural Study of the Niśītha Cūrṇi* (Delhi, 1975) was also very important for the purpose of historical study in which the contents of a source-book were analysed and documented so that the social historian could use it with profit.

[130]R.S. Mugali, *Kannaḍa Sāhitya Carite*, Mysore, 1953; H.M. Nayak ed., *Kannaḍa Adhyayana Samstheya Kannaḍa Sāhitya Carite*, Mysore, 1974–77; G.S. Shivarudrappa ed., *Samagra Kannaḍa Sāhitya Caritre*, Bangalore, 1974–78.

[131]Cf. Annaraya Mirji, *Jaina Dharma*, Mysore, 1969; B.V. Sirur, *Śravaṇa Belgolā*, Dharwar, 1976; etc.

It should be pointed out in this connection that most works on Jainism followed a stereotyped approach, one differing from the other only in regard to the details. In the case of philosophical studies, however, there was scope for interpretations and creative speculations which was further facilitated by the publication of the English rendering of Pandit Sukhlalji Sanghvi's new commentary on the *Tattvārthasūtra* (by K.K. Dikshit, Ahmedabad, 1974) in which the interpretations of the ancient commentators were reviewed and the doctrines reinterpreted. R. Singh's *Jain Conception of Omniscience* (Ahmedabad, 1974) was also an important contribution. The term 'omniscience' was attributed to God by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, but the Jains who did not believe in an omniscient God understood it in a different sense as essential characteristics of the Tīrthaṅkaras who were all-knowers and far above the gods. The Jain concept of knowledge also was discussed in this work in connection with the doctrine of the omniscience. N.J. Shah's edited volume under the title *Jain Philosophical Tracts* (Ahmedabad, 1974) contained articles of learned scholars on different aspects of Jain philosophy. Nathmal Tatia's *Studies in Jaina Philosophy* published from the Jain Cultural Research Society of Banaras was one of the most dependable and authoritative works which dealt with all the aspects of Jain philosophy in a modern perspective but in close dependence on the original texts and their commentaries. N.N. Bhattacharyya's *Jain Philosophy: Historical Outline* (Delhi, 1976) interpreted the fundamentals of Jain philosophy from the view point of their historical genesis and development from a comparative point of view against the backdrop of the Indian philosophical arena as a whole. Instead of depending on the accepted chronology, he had outlined two sharp divisions—the incipient stage and the sophisticated stage—on the basis of the textual contents and tried to show that the former stage of Jain thought tallied totally with the Pythagorean approach to philosophy which was based on observed realities and was quite in harmony with the existing socio-political conditions of the time of Lord Mahāvīra. The sophisticated stage was marked by *a priori* ideas which were grafted on the earlier thought-complex. The result was that the kernel was devoured by the accretions and the original dynamism of Jainism which contributed to the growth of physical, chemical and biological sciences with the total rejection of the concept of a supernatural agent in the form of God and the unique logical system based

on the principles of relativity was lost and replaced by such views of the life and the universe as were not probably desired by the founders of the system. D. Malvania's Hindi work *Jain Darśan Kā Adikār* (Ahmedabad, 1980) dealt with the growth of the Early Jain ideas while B.K. Matilal's *Central Philosophy of Jainism* (Ahmedabad, 1981) was a critical study of the Anekāntavāda from a very sophisticated philosophical point of view in which, apart from the traditional approach of other philosophical schools of India to it, allied western concepts were brought in to explain its intricacies. Among other works fundamental to the study of Jain philosophy mention should be made of D. Malvania and N.J. Shah's ed., *Studies in Indian Philosophy* (Pandit Sukhlalji Commemoration Volume, Ahmedabad, 1981), and S.M. Desai's *Haribhadra's Yoga Works and Psychosynthesis* (Ahmedabad, 1983). Y.J. Padmarajiah's *A Comparative Study of the Jain Theories of Reality and Knowledge* and Pushpa Bothra's *Jaina Theory of Perception* dealt with almost identical topics, though the latter had special orientation to a particular aspect of the traditional five aspects of knowledge. Both of these authors were keen to describe the process as to how the original Jain theories of knowledge came at par with those of other branches of Indian philosophy. It should be noted in this connection that the original meaning and significance of the *pratyakṣa* and the *parokṣa* as found in the earlier texts of Jainism became completely reversed in the later logical treatises.

Collet Caillat's *Atonements in Ancient Ritual of the Jaina Monks* (Ahmedabad, 1975) was an indepth study of Jain texts in which besides the usual account of the penances, the conceptual aspects behind the expiation of lapses were dealt with. Another work of the same author done in collaboration with R. Kumar was on Jain Cosmology. T.K. Tukol's *Sallekhana is not Suicide* (Ahmedabad, 1976) was an opinion-oriented study of a Justice who was torn between the letter of the law and the legitimacy of a convention rooted in the culture and conscience of individuals and caught between his personal religion and profession. His conclusion was, however, the same as the title of his work. A detailed treatment of his subject was subsequently made by S. Settar in his *Inviting Death* (Dharwar, 1986). Mainly based on archaeological sources it was divided into three big sections—Religious Backdrop for Ritual Experiments, Voluntary Termination of Life: Philosophy and Practice, and Art of Commemorating the Dead. In the first section the

religious history of Śravaṇa Belgola was traced with the death as its focal point which began with the ritual—death of a great monk and the events which followed characterising the progress of Jain ideas and institutions in a given space and time, analysing the inter-connections between the spiritual values and religious life, the link between the clergy and the laity, the role of temples and monasteries, the interaction between the envious sects, and the impact of all these on the fortunes of those who were seeking death. The second section attempted to answer several questions connected with ritual—death: What was meant by ritual death? How could death be invited? Who would aspire to die, for what reasons, and following which of the recommended canons? What were the big names in the history of death? What factors led the advocates of death to postpone and avoid it? How did society take such action over a period of time? In the third section, the *nisidhi* memorials erected in honour of those who accepted ritual-death were studied for the first time. Their format, their locale, the pattern of the grouping, the rituals associated with the commemoration, the significance of the term given to them, their variety, etc. were discussed. The *nisidhi*-memorials were previously studied neither by the art-historians nor by the socio-religious historians. This work thus explored a virgin field. It contained 64 drawings and 49 plates.

One of the important publications of 1977 was *Mahāvīra and His Teachings*, ed. A.N. Upadhye et al. (Bombay). J.C. Jain's *Vasudevahiṇḍi: An Authentic Jaina Version of the Bṛhatkathā* (Ahmedabad, 1977) was a remarkable contribution to the study of Jain narrative literature. Of other valuable works on Jainism published in the seventies mention may be made of K.K. Dikshit's *Early Jainism* (Ahmedabad, 1987) and G.C. Pande's *Śramaṇa Tradition: Its History and Contribution to Indian Culture* (Ahmedabad, 1978). Two edited volumes published in 1978 should also be mentioned in this connection. These were U.P. Shah's *Treasures of Jaina Bhandaras* and K.K. Chandra's *Prakrit Studies*, both published from Ahmedabad, the latter being the proceedings of a seminar. A.K. Chatterjee's *Comprehensive History of Jainism* (2 vols., Calcutta, 1978–84) dealt with the history and literature of Jainism from the earliest to the medieval period. Chatterjee had put forward in these volumes some interesting theories in regard to the dating of Jain literature. Reference should also be made in this connection to K.C. Lalwani's modernised English translation of the *Bhagavatī Sūtra* (4 vols., Calcutta, 1980). L.M. Joshi's *Facets of Jaina Religiousness in Comparative Light* (Ahmedabad, 1981) revealed a new approach to the understanding of certain aspects of Jainism. R. Vijailakshmy's *A Study of Civakacintāmaṇi* (Ahmedabad, 1981) was the study on the Tamil epic of that name which was of Jain inspiration. Previously Chakravarti gave an account of this epic, but a more comprehensive treatment was met with in Vijailakshmy's work. J.C. Jain's *Prakrit Narrative Literature: Origin and Growth* (New Delhi, 1981) was an elaborate study spanning over 2000 years from the sixth century BC to fifteenth century AD which gave a vivid account of tales discussing the use of social, religious, magical bird and journey motifs, representing the realistic life with social, cultural and socio-economic conditions of the common people, delineating their commercial and educational activities and their objects and nature of worship, gods and goddesses, rituals and practices, festivals and ceremonies, etc. The linguistic aspects of this work showed that the Jain writers had given a new twist to the literature by introducing new ideas. Suzuko Ohira's *A Study of the Tattvārtha-Sūtra with Bhāṣya* (Ahmedabad, 1982) was the latest addition to the study and interpretation of this most important sourcebook of Jain doctrines and marked a distinct modern stage in the continuity of the commentarial tradition developed in space and time.

CHAPTER 5

Studies on the Epics, Bhagavadgītā and Purāṇas

I

In the Vedic and Brahmanical tradition emphasis was laid upon the association and identification of the human faculties with those of nature, often upon seeking the source of unity behind all diversities, and from this sense of enquiry came into existence on the one hand an elaborate mythology and numerous beliefs and rituals of varying degrees seeking mastery over the forces of nature magically and symbolically, and on the other a pantheistic world-view later culminating in the equation of the universal and individual self. Buddhism and Jainism were basically concerned with human suffering and its extinction. Both these systems insisted on the inner faculties of the human being, the disciplining of body, mind and intellect. But there was also the other side of the shield based on Lokāyata or popular sentiments in which the idea of an all-powerful Supreme Being capable of bestowing grace on the devotees was found. The early Brahmanical, Buddhist and Jain emphasis on the doctrines of *karma* and metempsychosis prevented the growth of a genuine and all-embracing theism based on the concept of *bhakti* or absolute devotion and surrender to a personal God.[1] Such a concept found theoretical expression in the theistic interpretation of the Upaniṣads (the *Śvetāśvatara* is sometimes called the *Gītā* of the Śaivas), the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Bhagavadgītā* and the Purāṇas.

Regarding the *Mahābhārata* the following observation of Winternitz[2] is worth-quoting: "The *Mahābhārata* as a whole is a literary monster. Never has the hand of an artist attempted the well-nigh impossible task of combining the conflicting elements into one uni-

[1] A complete exposition of the doctrine of *bhakti* is to be found in the Sūtras of Śāṇḍilya (ed. and tr. J.R. Ballantyne, Calcutta, 1861) and Nārada (ed. and tr. by E.B. Cowell, Calcutta, 1878) which attempt in the manner of the Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa to demonsurate the greatness of the way of emancipation by surrendering all actions to God and feeling the greatest misery in forgetting God.

[2] *HIL*, I, 326–27.

fied poem. It is only unpoetical theologians and commentators and clumsy copists who have succeeded in conglomerating into a heterogeneous mass parts which are actually incompatible, and which date from different centuries. But in this jungle of poetry, which scholarship has only just begun to clear, there shoots forth much true and genuine poetry, hidden by wild undergrowth. Out of the unshapely mass shine out the most precious blossoms of immortal poetic art and profound wisdom. The very fact that the *Mahābhārata* represents a whole literature rather than one single and unified work, and contains so many and so multifarious things, makes it more suited than any other book, to afford us an insight into the deepest depths of the soul of the Indian people".

Since we are basically concerned with religious studies there is no need of recording here the editions and translations and works done on different aspects of this great epic.[3] The didactic portions of the *Mahābhārata* form the chief source of the study of the genesis and development of the theistic systems, especially of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism, apart from the doctrine of forbearance to the living beings, the power of destiny, efficacy of the Yajñas, renunciation and liberation, and glimpses of the Sāṅkhya, Vedānta and Yoga.[4] As early as in 1837 C. Lassen suggested that the original epic was augmented by interpolations of a Kṛṣṇaite nature alone.[5] Adolf

[3] An account of the earlier studies on the *Mahābhārata* and a systematic arrangements of its materials are to be found in Holtzmann, *Das Mahābhārata und seine Teile*, 4 vols., Kiel, 1892–95. For subsequent studies see A.D. Pusalker, *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, Bombay, 1955; Its structural growth was studied by A. Weber, *Indische Literatur geschichte*, Berlin, 1852, 179 ff.; A. Ludwig, *Abhandlungen etc.*, VI (12), 1884, 1 ff.; S. Sörensen, *Om Mahābhārata's Stelling i dem Indiske literatur*, Kjobenhaven, 1883; L.V. Schröder, *Indiens Literatur und Kultur*, Leipzig, 1887; Bühler and Kirste, 'Contribution to the History of the Mahābhārata' in *Sitz. Wien*, 1892; J. Dahlmann, *Genesis des Mahābhārata*, Berlin, 1899; H. Jacobi in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Berlin, 1899; 832 ff.; *Mahābharat-i, Inhaltsangabe*, Bonn, 1903; C.V. Vaidya, *The Mahābhārata: A Criticism*, Bombay, 1905; Grierson in *JRAS*, 1908, 837–44; H. Oldenberg, *Das Mahābhārata*, Göttingen, 1922; see also S. Lévi in *Bhandarkar Com. Vol.*, 99, 106; Eng. trans. in *ABORI*, I.13–20; C.H. Tawney in *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 1896, 347 ff.; J. Jolly in *Ind. Ant.*, XXV, 1896, 343 ff.; Winternitz in *JRAS*, 1897, 713 ff.

[4] Among the earlier works on the philosophical contents of the *Mahābhārata* mention may be made of P. Deussen, *Allgemenie Geschichte der Philosophie*, Leipzig, 1894, I(3), 8–144; P. Deussen and Otto Strauss, *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam*, Leipzig, 1906; E.W. Hopkins, *The Great Epic of India*, New York, 1901, 85–190; J. Dahlmann, *Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie als Naturlhare und Erlösungslehre nach dem Mahābhārata*, Berlin, 1902.

[5] *Indische Alterthumskunde*, I, 576 ff., 733 ff.; II, 101 ff.

Holtzmann in his *Das Mahābhārata und seine Teile* (Kiel, 1892–95) held that the original epic was in the honour of the Kauravas, of which Karṇa was the hero whose character was fashioned after a celebrated Buddhist ruler, perhaps Aśoka. The epic began with the Sabhā parvan and ended with the death of Duryodhana. At the first stage of the structural growth of the *Mahābhārata* the Śaivite elements, because of their anti-Brahmanic character, existed side by side with the Buddhist elements. Later, with the revival of Brahmanism, the Brāhmaṇas subjected the Buddhist *Mahābhārata* to a religious revision, used it as a weapon against the Buddhists and reversed its original purpose. The Pāṇḍavas were now lauded, Kṛṣṇa identified with Viṣṇu, and the Vaiṣṇava elements added. The third revision was of a Puranic type in which Buddhism was completely eliminated and Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa occupied the foreground. Dahlmann in his *Das Mahābhārata als Epos und Rechtbuch* (Berlin, 1895) considered Kṛṣṇa as belonging to the older portions of the epic. According to him the *Mahābhārata* was the work of a single poet who welded together the pre-existing narrative and didactic elements artistically with a view to popularising the Dharmasāstras among the masses. E.W. Hopkins in his *The Great Epic of India: Its Character and Origin* (New York, 1901) held that the origin of the epic lay in the priestly hymns accompanying the annual cycle and in the songs of praise of the liberality of princes, the *gāthā-nārāsāṃsis*. Around 400 BC the Bhārata lays were collected in which the Pāṇḍavas were yet unknown. Between 400 and 200 BC there sprang up the *Mahābhārata* tale in which the Pāṇḍavas were the heroes and Kṛṣṇa a demi-god. Between 200 BC and AD 100, Kṛṣṇa became the all-god and it was during this period that the didactic portions and new episodes were interpolated. Between AD 200 and 400 the introduction and later books were added. According to Sylvain Lévi,[6] Kṛṣṇa was the *persona sine qua non* of the entire epic. To him the *Mahābhārata* was "a deliberate composition organically and artistically spread around a central fact and inspired by a dominant sentiment which penetrates and permeates it". He compared the *Mahābhārata* with the Vinaya of the Buddhists and was of opinion that the whole great epic "with all its exaggerations and episodes, with all its luxuriant mass of detail" was based on nothing but "a code of Kṣatriya discipline as practised by the Bhāgavatas".

[6] *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*, 99 ff.; Eng. trans. in *ABORI*, I, 13 ff.

On the contrary, according to Winternitz,[7] Kṛṣṇa did not figure at all in the original epic, but was introduced only later, perhaps with the express intention of justifying the actions of the Pāṇḍavas, which were shady from the moral point of view, by representing them as inspired by the god Kṛṣṇa. "It is difficult to believe that Kṛṣṇa, the friend and counsellor of the Pāṇḍavas, Kṛṣṇa, the herald of the doctrines of the *Bhagavadgītā*, Kṛṣṇa, the youthful hero and demon-slayer, Kṛṣṇa, the favourite and lover of the cowherdesses, and finally Kṛṣṇa, the incarnation of the exalted god Viṣṇu, can be one and the same person. It is far more likely that there were two or several traditional Kṛṣṇas who were merged into one deity at a later time". Winternitz also held that it was the *warrior* Kṛṣṇa and not the god Kṛṣṇa that was too closely bound up with the main epic narrative. Garbe held that the Kṛṣṇa of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (III.17) who was a pupil of Ghora Āṅgirasa, was the same as the Kṛṣṇa of the *Bhagavadgītā*; and that he was the founder of the Bhāgavata religion; and like so many other founders of religions in India, he was made into an incarnation of the god worshipped by his adherents.[8] Oldenberg,[9] Jacobi[10] and Eliot[11] emphasised the point that Kṛṣṇa was not so essentially important in the story of the *Mahābhārata* as Rāma in that of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Subsequent generation of scholars again took up the Kṛṣṇa problem and their views will be presented later.

There is also an elaborate mythology in the *Mahābhārata*, the chief figures of which are the Vedic gods in their most pronounced anthropomorphised forms; numerous references to popular and folk deities, demi-gods, good and evil spirits, worship of tree, serpent, mountain, river, animate and inanimate objects, along with the Gandharvas, Vasus, Dikpālas, Yakṣas, Piśācas, Rākṣasas etc. are also found. A. Weber in 1852 attempted to establish an organic connection between the Vedic sources and the epic material.[12] Ludwig held that the *Mahābhārata* contained renovated forms of the ancient Vedic nature myths and it was primarily an allegorical poem on the struggle between the sun and the darkness of the

[7] *HIL*, I, 457.

[8] *Die Bhagavadgītā*, 27 ff.

[9] *Das Mahābhārata*, 37, 43.

[10] *ERE*, VII, 195 f.

[11] *Hinduism and Buddhism*, London, 1921, II, 154.

[12] *Indische Literaturgeschichte*, 179 ff.

night. The capture of the Kurukṣetra by the Bharatas, the confederation of the five tribes, etc. Constitute the historical kernel of the epic, on which the epic poet constructed a superstructure of a seasonal myth.[13] The mythology of the *Mahābhārata* was dealt with by J. Kennedy (1882), W.J. Wilkins (1870) and J. Dowson (1888), in their works on Hindu mythology. A complete study of the mythology of the *Mahābhārata* was, however, met with in V. Fausböll's *Indian Mythology* (Copenhagen, 1902) which dealt with the Asuras, Daityas, Dānavas, Dasyus, Nāgas, Rākṣasas, Piśācas, the warfare of Suras and Asuras, Brahman (both neuter and masculine), Sūrya, Indra, Varuṇa, Viṣṇu, Apsarās, Aśvins, Maruts, Pitṛs, Prajāpati, Ṛbhus, Rudras, Sādhya, Siddhas, Vālakhilyas, Vasus, Agni, Vāyu, Vidyādharas and Yakṣas with minutest detail and parallels of description from the *kāvya* literature. In the *Epic Mythology* (Strassburg, 1915) of Hopkins we find that the religion assumed as orthodox in both the epics was that which we call Brahmanical. The Vedic gods with Brahmā at their head were to be worshipped, as a matter of course. In addition came the constantly growing tendency to exact the chieftain demi-god from his position as clan-hero god to a higher power, till he was identified with Viṣṇu or a sectarian god of his type. Oldenberg in his *Das Mahābhārata* (1922) attempted to distinguish between the earlier and later stages of the great epic and held that the oldest portions were written at first in prose and then converted into poetry and that the ancient epic portrayed both parties in almost equal light and shade, the moral reflections cast on the conduct of the Pāṇḍavas pertaining to a more modern age. He also suggested that the whole role of the man-god Kṛṣṇa was a later contribution to the original theme.

A purely Indian point of view was reflected in Bankimchandra Chatterjee's *Kṛṣṇacaritra* (1892) which was written in Bengali and subsequently translated into various Indian languages. It was a valuable assessment of the historical character of Kṛṣṇa as described in the *Mahābhārata*, and the assessment was substantiated with evidence from other ancient works. Bankimchandra viewed the epic Kṛṣṇa as the most ideal human being who acted according to human motives and took no advantage of the divine superiority which he was supposed to possess. In most of the *Mahābhārata* situations he was exhibited in action as a prince or warrior and not as a divinity. He exercised no superhuman faculties in defence of himself, or

[13] *Abhandlungen der kgl. böhmischen ges. der. Wiss.*, VI (12), 1 ff.

his friends or in the defeat and destruction of his foes.[14] Bankimchandra like his European counterparts believed that the *Mahābhārata* was full of exaggerations and interpolations. He devised a methodology based on historical judgement to separate the interpolated passages and did it with absolute meticulation. He also believed that the *Mahābhārata* had a structural growth through the ages. But unlike the European scholars he was not ready to exclude the Pāṇḍavas in any stage of the structural growth of the great epic. According to him the basic story remained the same from the kernel to the later overgrowths. To him the European studies on the *Mahābhārata* were glaring examples of misplaced scholarship in which reality and common sense were both sacrificed for the sake establishing ego-centric wild theories. Kṛṣṇa was nowhere irrelevant in the *Mahābhārata*. The great epic had only one message to convey—the final triumph of *dharma* over *adharma*, of good over evil, of justice over injustice, which could be attained by means of a *dharmayuddha*, war for righteousness, for which Kṛṣṇa not only sided with the Pāṇḍavas in all their actions but also preached the ideal of *dharmayuddha* through the *Bhagavadgītā* which was an integral part of the *Mahābhārata*. Bankimchandra's *Kṛṣṇacaritra* had a great impact among the educated Indians. It was widely discussed, appreciated and criticised. Many authors of the regional languages of India made it a model and wrote on Kṛṣṇa. This point will be discussed later.

Apart from the *Bhagavadgītā*, which will be discussed later, the Nārāyaṇīya section of the *Mahābhārata* (XII. 334–51) is very important for the study of the theistic systems. It is a work in Puranic style which teaches that perfection can only be attained by *bhakti* and the grace of God, who appears here under the name of Nārāyaṇa. Here, too, we find Bhāgavata religion and the philosophy of Sāṅ-

[14] To illustrate his own viewpoint regarding Kṛṣṇa, Bankimchandra quoted the following sermon of Brookly: "We forget that Christ incarnate was such as we are, and some of us are putting him where he can be no example to us at all. Let no fear of losing the dear great truth of the divinity of Jesus make you lose the dear great truth of the humanity of Jesus. He took upon himself our nature; as a man of the like passions, he fought that terrible fight in the wilderness; year by year, as an innocent man, he was persecuted by narrow-hearted Jews; and his was a humanity whose virtue was pressed by all the needs of the multitude and yet kept its richness of nature; a humanity which, though given up to death on the cross, expressed all that is within the capacity of our own humanity; and if we really follow him we shall be holy even as he is holy".

khya and Yoga mingled with Vedantic ideas. Intensive study on this section was made by R.G. Bhandarkar[15] and also by G.A. Grierson.[16] It was translated into German by Duessen[17] and into Dutch by C. Lecoutere.[18] In this section there is an allusion of the Śvetadvīpa or white island. J. Kennedy,[19] R. Garbe[20] and Grierson[21] tried to suggest on the basis of this allusion that this white island must have been a place in central or western Asia which was inhabited by the Nestorian Christians under whose influence the *bhakti* idea of the Nārāyaṇīya section received a new dimension. But such views are untenable without any genuine historical basis as has been demonstrated by Raychaudhuri.[22] We have already had the occasion to refer to the studies in the philosophy of the *Mahābhārata* which is a conglomeration of the Sāṅkhya, Vedānta and Yoga (interpolated sections like the Śanatsujātīya refer exclusively to the Vedānta) but as manual of philosophy it has no special value. The doctrines were rather artificially grafted with the body of the great epic and as such it is difficult to agree with the views of Dahlmann and Deussen that the *Mahābhārata* represents a 'transition philosophy' between the philosophy of the Upaniṣads and that of the later systems.

Many scholars tried to treat epic mythology from an allegorical point of view. For example, L. Dhar attempted to demonstrate the solar character of the Pāṇḍava heroes. The Kauravas were regarded by him as the principle of darkness. Draupadī's wedding was regarded as the epic version of the Vedic solar myth of the marriage of Uṣas with the sun. The war was nothing but the slaying of the dragon of darkness and the triumph of Uṣas.[23] An extreme example of this type of research was N.V. Thadani's *Mystery of the Mahābhārata* (in five volumes, Karachi, 1931–35) in which it was held that the *Mahābhārata* was the symbolisation of all the six systems of Hindu philosophy. G.I. Held's *The Mahābhārata: An*

[15] *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Strassburg, 1913, 4 ff.

[16] *Ind. Ant.*, XXXVII, 1908, 251 ff., 373 ff.

[17] *Philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam*, Leipzig, 1906, 748 ff.

[18] *Mélanges Charles de Harlez*, Leiden, 1896, 162 ff.

[19] *JRAS*, 1907, 481 f.

[20] *Archiv für Religious geschichte*, XVI, 1913, 516 ff.; *Indien und das Christentum*, Tubingen, 1914, 192 ff.

[21] *ERE*, II, 549. [22] *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect*, 79 ff.

[23] *Woolner Com. Volume*, 311–16.

Ethnological Study (London, 1935) began with a history of the critical study of the *Mahābhārata* stating the problems and points for further study. According to him the relationship terminology in the epic is largely of a classificatory nature; the terms expressive of relationship did not denote blood relationship but clan connection. Other issues of anthropological interest, especially those pertaining to beliefs and rituals were also discussed in this work. Among other works mention should be made of J.C. Majumdar's *Ethics of the Mahābhārata* (Calcutta, 1953) and V.S. Sukthankar's *On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata* (Bombay, 1957). There was, however, no dearth of good articles on different aspects of the religion of the *Mahābhārata*, such as H.C. Raychaudhuri's 'The Great Epic of India',[24] H.G. Narahari's 'Karma and Reincarnation in the Mahābhārata',[25] N.M. Chaudhury's 'Liṅga Worship in the Mahābhārata',[26] J.C. Ghosh's 'Ekānaṃśā and Subhadrā',[27] A.P. Karmarkar's 'Matsyāvatāra',[28] N.C. Kelkar's 'Riddle of the Curse in the Mahābhārata',[29] etc. H.D. Sankalia in his 'Iconographical elements in the Ādi Parva'[30] studied the descriptions of the deities and came to the conclusion that at the earlier stage of the evolution of the iconography Śiva, Viṣṇu and Sūrya and the goddesses Śrī and Sarasvatī were conceived of having two hands and one face. He also found the growing influence of Viṣṇu and his identification with Kṛṣṇa. The Paraśurāma legends as found in the *Mahābhārata* were studied from various point of view by Jarl Charpentier,[31] P. Anujan Achan,[32] K.M. Munshi,[33] A.D. Pusalker,[34] Iravati Karve,[35] J.C. Chakko,[36] etc.

[24] Incorporated in his *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, Calcutta, 1932, 275–93.

[25] *ABORI*, XXVII, 102–13.

[26] *IHQ*, XXIV, 269–92.

[27] *JASB* (L) 1, no. 3.

[28] *Festschrift Kane*, 253–57.

[29] *ABORI*, XXV, 51–62.

[30] *BDCRI*, V, 149–51.

[31] *Kuppuswami Com. Volume*, 9–16.

[32] Paper published by Cochin Arch. Dept.

[33] *New Ind. Ant.*, VI, no. 8.

[34] *Gopalaswamy Com. Volume*.

[35] *Jour. Univ. Bombay*, I, 115–39.

[36] *Jour. of the Rama Varma Res. Inst.*, XII, 1–11.

The Kṛṣṇa problem did not cease to continue notwithstanding many important previous works in this field. Tadpatrikar in his *Kṛṣṇa Problem* (Poona, 1928)[37] dealt with the episodes from the life of Kṛṣṇa as described in the great epic and the Purāṇas. Walter Ruben's *Kṛṣṇa* (Wein, 1941) was a systematisation of the Kṛṣṇa legends as found in the epic. On the basis of the Puranic sources he had written 'On the original Text of the Kṛṣṇa Epic'.[38] In a second article he aimed at showing that the original supplement (*khila*) of the *Mahābhārata* was much shorter than the *Khila-Harivaṃśa* which was the first arranged biography of Kṛṣṇa.[39] In a third article entitled 'Puranic Line of the Heroes' he sought to prove that the *Harivaṃśa* was a genuine supplement of the *Mahābhārata* and it might be described as the oldest Purāṇa.[40] S.L. Katre in his 'Kṛṣṇa and the Mahābhārata War'[41] gave a detailed account of the part played by Kṛṣṇa in the Bhārata war. He also made a comparative study of the Jarāsandha episode as found in the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas and concluded that while in the former Kṛṣṇa was represented in his essentially human colours, in the latter pure divinity was ascribed to him.[42] The childhood of Kṛṣṇa was reconstructed by W. Kirfel from various sources.[43] V.R.R. Dikshitar tried to prove that the cult of Kṛṣṇa attained popularity in the Tamil country in the early centuries of the Christian era.[44] B.M. Chaudhuri upheld the view that the concept of Gopāla Kṛṣṇa was of Ābhīra origin and that there was no connection between the cult of child Gopāla and the conception of child Jesus in his 'Indian Cowherd God'.[45] S.K. De in his 'Vedic and Epic Kṛṣṇa' raised some important questions regarding the supposed identification of the Kṛṣṇa of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and that of the great epic.[46] In A.D. Pusalkar's 'Historicity of Kṛṣṇa'[47] the epic and related sources

[37] Previously pub. in *ABORI*, X, 269–344.

[38] *Festschrift Thomas*, 188–203.

[39] *JAOS*, LXI, 115–27.

[40] *JRAS*, 1941, 247–56.

[41] *Allahabad Univ. Studies*, VIII, 193–222.

[42] *IHQ*, VIII, 500–508; IX, 856–65.

[43] *Festgabe Jacobi*, 298–316.

[44] *Ind. Cult.*, IV, 267–71.

[45] *JBORS*, Dec. 1942.

[46] *IHQ*, XVIII, 297–301.

[47] Originally published in the *Glory that was Gurjaradesa*, I, 111–27 and subsequently incorporated in his *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, Bombay, 1955, 49–81.

were thoroughly analysed and modern views on this subject critically examined.

Bankimchandra's *Kṛṣṇacaritra*, to which we have already had the occasion to refer earlier, evoked great interest among the Indian intelligentsia and led many Indian scholars to think and write on Kṛṣṇa. It also evoked criticism from different corners. For example Sri Aurobindo observed: "He saw that in certain parts of the poem (*Mahābhārata*) Kṛṣṇa's godhead is either not presupposed at all or only slightly affirmed, while in others it is the main objective of the writer; certain parts again give us a plain, unvarnished and straight forward biography and history, others are a mass of wonders and legends, often irrelevant extravagances; in some parts also the conception of the chief characters is radically departed from defaced. He, therefore, took these differences as his standard and accepted only those parts as genuine which give a plain and consistent account of Kṛṣṇa the man and of others in relation to him. Though his conclusions are to a great extent justifiable, his *a priori* method led him to exaggerate them, to enforce them too rigidly without the proper flexibility and scrupulous hesitation and to resort occasionally to special pleading".[48] So far as the interpolated portions of the *Mahābhārata* were concerned, Bankimchandra's methodology was rather oversimplified: (1) that which is not mentioned in the *parvasaṃgraha*;[49] (ii) that which is not referred to in the *anukramaṇikā* chapter; (iii) if two contradictory statements are found at two different places one of them must be an interpolation; (iv) inconsistency in the literary style; (v) when facts are contrary to the nature of the person concerned; (vi) that which is irrelevant; and (vii) that which is supernatural or miraculous. Rabindranath Tagore raised some valid points against this methodology. He held that it was entirely a subjective test and even a good poet might write occasionally some bad lines. Bankimchandra cited two imaginary instances. If anywhere it is found stated the Bhīṣma was attached to somebody's wife or that Bhīma showed cowardice that must be an interpolation, because such facts do not suit the persons concerned. Rabindranath Tagore states that this too was not a safe criterion because a great writer is not afraid of

[48] Aurobindo, *Vyāsa and Vālmīki*, 64–65.

[49] Sukthankar observed: "it has been common experience that figures in ancient works, if at all complicated, seldom come out right, and the figures of the *parvasaṃgraha* are probably no exception to this rule".

showing occasional inconsistency in the characters created by him, while the third rate writers are always careful to make the heroes consistently good or persistently wicked. The most important portion of the *Kṛṣṇacaritra* is the sixth book dealing with the part played by Kṛṣṇa in the Bhārata war. The *Mahābhārata* reveals Kṛṣṇa here as a crafty and cruel person, taking recourse to stratagems considered as dishonourable. But Bankimchandra dismissed many of the objectionable deeds of Kṛṣṇa with the help of his interpolation theory, and where that theory did not work he said that all the incidents casting aspersions on the character of Kṛṣṇa were probably inserted on account of sectarian animosity of the Śaivas and other sects hostile to Kṛṣṇa.[50] Bankimchandra defended all the policies adopted and activities undertaken by Kṛṣṇa on the ground that the supreme need of establishing the kingdom based on righteousness demanded this. To him Kṛṣṇa was an ideal person in whom the synthetic development of all the mental and physical faculties took place simultaneously. But Rabindranath Tagore offered a perfectly valid criticism against the *Kṛṣṇacaritra* when he said that the hero of the work was not really Kṛṣṇa but the rationalism of Bankimchandra.[51]

Bankimchandra showed that the *Mahābhārata* was a historical work, though accretions in the form of supernatural stories were there, but such defects were also found in the works of Herodotus, Lévi and ancient historians. While most Western scholars of the last century held Kṛṣṇa to be a mythical or allegorical figure, Bankimchandra maintained that he was really a historical personage. Other Indian writers also followed him in establishing the historical personality of Kṛṣṇa.[52] For example, Bipin Chandra Pal said that "Kṛṣṇa represents the ideal of the Indian type of humanity. Historically, he has been the supreme teacher of our people. He has given us the highest philosophy of both our individual and our composite social life. In his life and teachings India has found the master-key to the secrets of her nation-building, and a rational synthesis of all the outer differences and conflicts of her diverse

[50]Hopkins, too considered these episodes as interpolations in another sense. He held that these episodes were inseparable from the older heroic narrative and had therefore remained in the present form of the epic. *The Great Epic of India*, 375.

[51]Adhunik Sahitya, *Rabindra Rachanāvali*, Santiniketan, IX, 447 ff.

[52]There were exceptions like Pramananda Bharati. See his *Śrī Kṛṇa*, New York, 1904.

races and communities and the confusions of her numerous cults, cultures, religions and philosophies".[53] T.L. Vaswami, like Bipin Chandra Pal, was more concerned with the significance of Kṛṣṇa's political life as found in the *Mahābhārata*.[54] Bhagavan Das held that Kṛṣṇa combined thought, emotion and action in an extraordinary way. He first showed the epic Kṛṣṇa as a man of action, history-maker and fighter for just causes and then explained his role as a man of emotion and inspirer of devotion.[55] In K.M. Munshi's brilliant work *Kṛṇāvatāra* (3 vols.) the epic sources were adequately utilised and it appears that he was fully acquainted with K.M. Jhaveri's Gujarati translation of Bankim Chandra's *Kṛṇacaritra*.

In 1905 C.V. Vaidya in his *The Mahabharata: A Criticism*[56] brought out some important points regarding the development of Vaiṣṇavism. He pointed out that certain statement on the *Mahābhārata* were preserved by mistake or accident and these proved that the original work of Vyāsa was considerably different from its present form. He sought to prove that Vyāsa did not always side with Kṛṣṇa but expressed his sentiments without bias, even if they went to Kṛṣṇa's discredit. He further showed that at one stage of the development of the epic, Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma were regarded as partial incarnations. But in other portions of the *Mahābhārata*, especially in the speeches of Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa was depicted as Supreme Being. N.K. Siddhanta[57] distinguished four stages of the *Mahābhārata*: (i) court-poems of the Heroic Age itself, (ii) epic or narrative poems based on the old court poems, (iii) old stories with moral and religious interest attached to them, praising the superiority of the priesthood, and (iv) the complete sinking into background of the heroic interest with didacticism becoming large. The unhistorical elements in the heroic poetry were classified under (a) the introduction of gods, (b) folk-tale elements, (c) myth, (d) creative fiction, and (e) mistakes in history. Religion was treated in this volume under the heads of mythology, gods, temples, sacrifice and funeral customs. As early as in 1920 H.C. Raychaudhuri in his *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect* said that in writing about Kṛṣṇa most writers "began at the wrong end with the late epic and Puranic

[53]B.C. Pal, *Śrī Krishna*, Madras, n.d., 7–8.

[54]*Śrī Krishna, the Saviour of Humanity*, Madras, 1921, 19ff.

[55]Bhagavan Das, *Kṛṇa*, Madras, 1929, 36–45.

[56]His *Epic India*, Bombay, 1907 also contained religious informations.

[57]*The Heroic Age of India*, London, 1929.

legends instead of the right end with the early Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads". V.V. Iyer's *Notes of a Study of the Preliminary Chapters of the Mahābhārata* (Madras, 1922) attempted to separate the genuine and spurious matters based on a comparative examination of the four recensions of the epic and Nannaya's Telugu translation of the *Mahābhārata*. Although earlier writers who worked on the structural growth of the *Mahābhārata* peeped into the Vedic sources of the epics, it was V.V. Dixit's *Relation of the Epics to the Brāhmaṇa Literature* (Poona, 1950) which made a systematic enquiry in the arena of Brāhmaṇa literature, the *ākhyānas* and *itihāsas* embodied in the Brāhmaṇas which were often recited during the *yajñas*, as well as the hero-legends (*gāthā-nārāśāṃsī*) sung in praise of mighty princes and warriors to the accompaniment of a musical instrument which in the *Mahābhārata* itself was called *saptatantrīvīṇā* (seven-stringed lyre). He also traced the roots of many epic characters to the Brāmaṇa literature.

D.D. Kosambi in his *Myth and Reality* (Bombay, 1962) held that the *Gītā* must be regarded as an interpolation because Kṛṣṇa as he appeared in the *Mahābhārata* was singularly ill-suited to propound a really moral doctrine. He said: "At every single crisis of the war, his advice wins the day by the crookedest of means which could never have occurred to the others. To kill Bhīṣma, Śikhaṇḍin was used as a living shield against whom that perfect knight would not raise a weapon, because of doubtful sex. Droṇa was polished off while stunned by the deliberate false report of his son's death. Karṇa was shot down against all rules of chivalry when dismounted and unarmed; Duryodhana was bludgeoned to death after a foul mace blow that shattered his thigh. This is by no means the complete list of iniquities. When taxed with this transgressions, Kṛṣṇa replies bluntly at the end of the Śalyaparvan that the man could not have been killed in any other way, that victory could never have been won otherwise. The calculated treachery of the *Arthaśāstra* saturates the action of this divine exponent of the *Bhagavadgītā*". Bimanbehari Majumdar's *Kṛṣṇa in History and Legend* (Calcutta, 1969) attempted to trace the development of the ideas relating to Kṛṣṇa from the days of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* to the present time. A considerable portion of this work was based upon the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhagavadgītā*. He compared the *Mahābhārata* evidences with those found in the *Harivaṃśa* and the *Bhāgavata*. The work contained six chapters under the titles (i) Chronological

puzzles regarding the life and time of Kṛṣṇa, (ii) Early life of Kṛṣṇa in sculpture and literature, (iii) Kṛṣṇa in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata*, (iv) Kṛṣṇa's life at Dvārakā, (v) Rādhā, and (vi) Interpretations of the life of Kṛṣṇa in modern India, and four appendices under the titles (i) Kṛṣṇa in the *Bhagavadgītā*, (ii) Holy places associated with the early life of Kṛṣṇa, (iii) Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in medieval literature, and (iv) did Kṛṣṇa belong to the pre-Aryan or non-Aryan stock? The modern successor of Bimanbehari was A.C. Chakravarti whose work under the self explanatory title *The Story of Kṛṣṇa in Indian Literature* (Calcutta, 1976) was a laudable contribution.

The story of the preparation of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* under the responsibility of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute of Poona was narrated by A.D. Pusalker in his *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*. Various questions were raised by eminent epic scholars in regard to the methodology adopted and the questions and their replies in defence of the methodology by Sukthankar became subject matter of many a learned paper. Sukthankar's *Critical Studies in the Mahābhārata* was subsequently published by 1944 being edited by P.K. Gode and sponsored by Sukthankar Memorial Edition Committee of Poona. The Ādiparvan was published in 1933 along with a Prolegomena which covered practically all aspects of the *Mahābhārata* text criticism and was a brilliant exposition of the entire text problem. Winternitz called it "the most important event in the history of Sanskrit philology since the publication of Max Müller's edition of the *Ṛgveda*".[58] It was completed in the sixties. Apart from the critical edition, among other remarkable works on the *Mahābhārata* mention should be made of Sörensen's *Index* which was published posthumously being revised and completed by Dines Anderson and Elof Olesen (London, 1904–25). Another posthumous work was the Italian versified translation of selected episodes of the *Mahābhārata* in five volumes prepared by Michila Kerbaker and brought out by Carlo Formici and Vittor Pisani (Rome, 1933–39). The credit of publishing the first translation of the critical edition in any language went to Russia.[59]

[58] *ABORI*, XV, 159.

[59] The whole of the *Mahābhārata* was translated into English prose by K.M. Ganguli (pub. by P.C. Roy, Calcutta, 1884–96) and M.N. Dutt (Calcutta, 1895–1905); metrical translation partly in prose extracts by R.C. Dutt (London, 1899); extracts

II

Of all the didactic portions of the *Mahābhārata* none has attained to such popularity and fame as the *Bhagavadgītā*. Although basically it pertains to the Bhāgavatas or Vaiṣṇavas, it has transgressed its sectarian limits and become a textbook of devotion and edification of all Hindu sects. The *Bhagavadgītā* presents a relatively fixed consistent text without any noteworthy variation through the ages. Outside India, too, the *Bhagavadgītā* has gained many admirers. It was appreciated very highly by Al-Bīrūnī who had translated some of its portions in Arabic. Countless are its manuscripts, printed versions, translations and interpretations.

In Europe the *Bhagavadgītā* was first made known by means of the English translation of Charles Wilkins (London, 1785). The critical text edition of it by August Wilhelm von Schlegel, which appeared in 1823, with a Latin translation appended, created a stir among the German intelligentsia. It was of much inspiration to Wilhelm von Humboldt who wrote to his friend Friedrich von Gentz that "it is perhaps the deepest and loftiest thing the world has to show" He placed the *Bhagavadgītā* far above Lucretius, Permenides and Empedocles.[60] It is interesting to note that Hégel made a very adverse review of Schlegel's work because "he had no faith in oriental wisdom". An account of the earlier studies on the *Bhagavadgītā*, its translations both in Indian and European languages, was provided by A. Holtzmann.[61] After Charles Wilkins the English translations of the *Gītā* were made respectively by J.C. Thomson (1855), K.T. Telang (in verse 1875, in prose 1882), John Davis (1882), Edwin Arnold (1885), L.D. Barnett, Annie Besant

translated by John Muir in *Original Sanskrit Texts* (1858–72) and metrical translations from Sanskrit Writers (London, 1879), by M. Monier-Williams in *Indian Wisdom* (London, 1875); summary of 18 parvans by Monier-Williams in *Indian Epic Poetry* (London, 1863), by J.C. Oman in his *The Indian Great Epics* (London, 1899); French trans.: Books I–X by H. Fauche (Paris, 1863–70); a collection of larger extracts by Ph.E. Foucaux, *Le Mahābhārata*, Paris, 1862. Several episodes were translated into Italian by P.E. Pavolini (1902) and into German by F. Bopp (1824), F. Ruckert (1878), A. Holtzmann, *Indische Sagen* (1845–47, new ed. by M. Winternitz, 1912, 1921), J. Hertel, *Indische Märchen* (1919) and W. Porzig in *Indische Erzähler* series, XII, XV, (1923).

[60] Humboldt dealt in detail with the *Gītā* in a long dissertation of the Berlin Academy (1825–26), *Über die unter dem Namen Bhagavadgītā bekannte Episode des Mahābhārata*, and in a lengthy review of Schlegel's edition and translation.

[61] *Das Mahābhārata*, II, 129 ff.

and Bhagavan Das (1905), C.C. Caieb (1911) and others. German translations were made respectively by C.R.S. Peiper (1869), F. Lorinser (1869), R. Boxberger (1870), R. Garbe (1905), P. Deussen (1906) and L.V. Schroeder (1912). The learned introduction of K.T. Telang in his prose translation of the *Gītā*[62] contained all informations in relation to the text and its contents. The teachings of the *Gītā* were nicely summarised by R.G. Bhandarkar[63] and J.E. Carpenter.[64] Some less known monographs on the *Gītā* were discussed by P.E. Pavolini.[65]

Since the *Gītā* sought to combine various streams of ancient Indian religio-philosophical schools of thought some contradictions could not have been avoided. Most scholars hold that all these contradictions resulted from the fact that the *Bhagavadgītā* was not a systematic philosophical work, but a mystical poem. Humboldt observed: "It is a sage, speaking out of the fullness and inspiration of his knowledge and of his feeling, not a philosopher trained in a school, classifying his material in accordance with a definite method, and arriving at the last principles of his doctrine by a skilful chain-work of ideas". The same feeling was expressed by K.T. Telang,[66] E.W. Hopkins,[67] L.V. Schroeder,[68] B. Faddegon,[69] D.V.H. Labherton,[70] R.G. Bhandarkar,[71] O. Strauss,[72] A.B. Keith,[73] H. Oldenberg,[74] J.N. Farquhar,[75] and H. Jacobi.[76] According to Franklin Edgerton it is "poetic, mystical and devotional, rather than logical and philosophical".[77] On the other hand some schol-

[62] *SBE*, VIII.

[63] *Vaiṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Strassburg, 1913, 14 ff.

[64] *Theism in Medieval India*, London, 1921, 250 ff.

[65] *Giornale della societa Asiatica Italiana*, XXIV, 1911, 395 ff.

[66] *SBE*, VIII, 11 ff.

[67] *JRAS*, 1905, 384 ff.

[68] German trans. of the *Gītā*, intro.

[69] *Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya*, Amsterdam, 1906, 12 ff.

[70] *ZDMG*, LXVI, 1912, 603 f.

[71] *Vaiṇavism, Śaivism, etc.* 157 ff.

[72] *Giornale*, XXIV, 1911, 310 ff.; *ZDMG*, LXVII, 1913, 714 ff.

[73] *JRAS*, 1913, 197; 1915, 548.

[74] *Das Mahābhārata*, 39, 43, 70 ff.

[75] *Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, London, 1920, 90 ff.

[76] *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1921, 715 ff.; 1922, 266 ff.

[77] *The Bhagavadgītā Interpreted*, Chicago, 1925; see also his *Song of the Blessed One*, Chicago, 1925.

ars maintained that the contradictions of the *Gītā* could better be explained by the assumption that the poem had not come down to us in its original form, but like most parts of the *Mahābhārata* had only received its present form as a result of interpolations and revisions. Holtzmann assumed that the *Bhagavadgītā* had originally been a pantheistic poem which was remodelled later by the devotees of Viṣṇu into a theistic poem. According to Deussen, it was a late product of the degeneration of the monistic thought of the Upaniṣads representing the period of transition from theism to realistic atheism. Garbe thought it to be a textbook of the Bhāgavatas which was revised and fabricated by the Brāhmaṇas from a Vedantic viewpoint. Hopkins held that it was a Kṛṣṇite version of an older Viṣṇuite poem which in turn was a later Upaniṣad.

It was Richard Garbe who in his translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* made a direct attempt to reconstruct the original poem by printing in small type all verses which he considered unauthentic and interpolated from the view point of the Vedānta philosophy and the orthodox Brahmanical religion. Grierson, too agreed with Garbe in counting the passages where 'brahmanism' was taught among the 'later portions of the *Gītā*.[78] Garbe's approach was also supported by F.O. Schrader[79] and A. Hillebrandt.[80] Winternitz agreed with Garbe on certain points like the facts that the original *Bhagavadgītā* was much shorter, that the work in its present form contained many interpolations and additions and that those passages where mention is suddenly made of the *brahman* without any reference to Kṛṣṇa whatsoever as well as the passages where rituals and sacrifices were recommended or glorified were interpolated. But at the same time he held that it was not justified in pronouncing all those passages in which Kṛṣṇa spoke of himself as immanent in the world as interpolated.[81] Many scholars who did not subscribe to Garbe's views also did not believe in the unity of the *Gītā*. Hopkins, for example, spoke of the *Gītā* as 'Clearly ... rewritten by a modernising hand'. According to him the very fact that the *Bhagavadgītā* contained exactly 18 chapters, just as the *Mahābhārata* was divided into 18 parvans and as there were 18 Purāṇas, was

[78] *ERE*, II, 540 ff.; *Ind. Ant.*, XXXVII, 1908, 257.

[79] *ZDMG*, LXIV, 640.

[80] *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1915, 628.

[81] *HIL*, I, 436.

suspicious. The eleventh canto where Kṛṣṇa revealed himself to Arjuna in his godlike form was of the nature of a Purāṇa rather than like the work of the poet of the first sections.[82] Lévi took the *Bhagavadgītā* as an integral part of the *Mahābhārata*. This view was contested by Hopkins who went to the length of stating that it was even unnecessary to prove it. Most scholars, however, held that the original epic included a very short dialogue between Arjuna and the charioteer Kṛṣṇa. This dialogue was the germ from which the present didactic poem grew. According to Oldenberg it was likely that the earliest *Gītā* concluded with II.38 and that the chapters XIII–XVIII were appendices to it. Jacobi endeavoured to trace in the *Gītā* those verses of the first and second chapters which belonged to the old epic.[83]

As Winternitz had rightly observed, in spite of all contradictions the whole character of the *Gītā* was predominantly theistic in which God appeared as an essentially personal god who—as a teacher and in human incarnation—required devotion of his worshippers. The concepts of devotion (*bhakti*) and grace (*prasāda*) induced some scholars to suggest that the Indian *bhakti* cult in general and the *Bhagavadgītā* in particular were influenced by Christian ideas. F. Lorinser in the appendix to his translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* said that he was convinced "that the author of the *Bhagavadgītā* not only knew and frequently utilised the scriptures of the *New Testament* but also wove into his system Christian ideas and views in general" and that he wished to prove that this much-admired monument of the ancient Indian mind, this most beautiful and most exalted didactic poem, which can be regarded as one of the most precious blossoms of heathen philosophy owes its purest and the most highly praised doctrines for the most part" to Christian sources. In this connection what Winternitz said is worth quoting: "Lorinser's thorough investigation in itself proves that this is parallelism of development, highly interested for the history of religion, and not a case of borrowing of the more than a hundred passages from the Gospels which Lorinser quotes as parallel with passages in the *Bhagavadgītā*. I have found twenty-five at the most that are of such a kind that a case of borrowing could be at all thought of. Not in one single instance, however, is the resemblance such that the supposition of borrowing were made probable than of an accidental agreement. Mystical love

[82] *The Great Epic of India*, pp. 215–34 ff., 371.

[83] *ZDMG*, LXXII, 1918, 323 ff.

towards God, too, is not limited to Christianity. I need refer to Sufism, in which it plays no less a part than with the Christian mystics".[84] Weber too in his 'Griechen in Indien'[85] traced *bhakti* back to Christian influences, and though he was of opinon that Lorinser went too far, he found a great deal of similarity between Kṛṣṇa and Christ.[86] The influence of Christianity on the Indian doctrine of *bhakti* was also suggested by A.C. Burnell[87] and G.A. Grierson.[88] J. Kennedy also found common elements between the legends of Kṛṣṇa and those of Christ.[89]

E.W. Hopkins was the only scholar who had expressed a decided opinion in favour of the theory that the *Bhagavadgītā* was influenced by Christianity.[90] G. Howells compared the doctrines of the *Gītā* with those of the *New Testament* and sought to trace points of agreement without asserting that the *Gītā* was influenced by Christianity.[91] This question was dealt with in detail by R. Garbe who held that the doctrine of *bhakti* could be explained by earlier Indian teachings and that the hypothesis of Christian influence on the *Bhagavadgītā* was unlikely on historical grounds.[92]

So far as the date of the *Bhagavadgītā* is concerned, Garbe held that its composition began in the second century BC which assumed its present form in the second century AD. K.T. Telang thought that it was earlier than the third century BC.[93] According to R.G. Bhandarkar "it was not later than the beginning of the fourth century BC", while Edgerton held that "all that we can say is that it was probably composed before the beginning of our era, but not more than a few centuries before".[95] Tilak, Radhakrishnan, K.N.

[84] *HIL*, I, 431 n.

[85] *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Academie*, 1890, 930.

[86] Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī: Eng. trans. in *Ind. Ant.*, III, 21 ff.; VI, 161 ff.

[87] *Ind. Ant.*, III, 108; IV, 153; V, 25.

[88] *JRAS*, 1907. Grierson's view was very much restricted. Cf. *ERE*, II, 545 ff.

[89] 'The Child Kṛṣṇa, Christianity and Gujars' in *JRAS*, 1907, 951 ff.

[90] 'Christ in India' in *India, Old and New*, New York, 1902, 146 ff.

[91] *The Soul of India*, London, 1913, 425 ff.

[92] *Indien und das Christentum*, 1914, 227ff. See also J. Muir in *Ind. Ant.*, IV, 77ff.; A. Barth, *Religions of India*, London, 1881, 220 f.; J. Van den Gheyn in *Le Museon*, XVII, 57 ff.; L.J. Sedgwick, *JBBRAS*, XXIII, 111 ff.; A.B. Keith in *JRAS*, 1907, 490 ff.

[93] *SBE*, VIII, 34.

[94] *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, etc.* 13.

[95] *The Bhagavadgītā Interpreted*, Chicago, 1925.

Upadhyaya, E. Deutsch and L. Siegel, M. Hiriyanna, M.A. Mehendale, Romila Thapar, Suvira Jaiswal, R.C. Zaehner, Aravind Sharma and G.C. Pande held that it was composed before the beginning of the Christian era and their dating varied from the fifth to the first century BC. Farquhar, Bajaj, Arnold, Sardesai and Kosambi suggested post-Christian dates. F. Otto Schrader first brought to light the Kashmirian recension of the *Bhagavadgītā* in 1930 and contributed important papers on it.[96] S.K. Belvalkar had examined the Kashmirian recension in his edition of the *Bhagavadgītā* and he said that the comparison of this recension with the Śaṅkara text showed that in a number of passages the Kashmirian reading sought (i) to regularise the grammar, (ii) to improve the syntax, and (iii) to improve the sense. According to him, the Kashmirian recension was not current prior to the eight century A.D. and not more authentic except for about a dozen minor variants. "The form of the Bhagavadgītā as preserved in the Bhāṣya of Śaṅkarācārya is still the earliest and most authentic form of the poem that we can reach on the basis of the available manuscript evidence."[97]

We have already had occasion to refer to some of the earlier translations of the *Bhagavadgītā*. Among subsequent translations, the one made by W.D.P. Hill (Oxford, 1928) contained the vulgate text, an index, an argument and a commentary. The introduction dealt with the cult of Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva, composition and age and an exposition of the doctrine. There were also bibliographical notes, Sanskrit index and subject index. Among other translations of the *Bhagavadgītā* may be included the metrical translation of A.W. Ryder (Chicago, 1930), E.J. Thomas's *Song of the Lord* with introduction and notes (London, 1931), Purohit Swami's *The Gospel of the Lord Śrīkṛṣṇa* (London, 1935) and Anil Baran Roy's *The Message of the Gītā as interpreted by Śrī Aurobinbdo* (Bombay, 1938) which contained besides the text and translation copious notes, appendices, glossary and index. S.K. Belvalkar's English translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* (Poona, 1943) contained a learned introduction

[96] 'On the Form of the Bhagavadgītā contained in the Kashmirian Mahābhārata' in *JRAS*, 1935, 146–49; 'Rezensionen der Bhagavadgītā' in *Fest. Winternitz*, 41–50; 'An Implication of the Bhagavadgītā Riddle', *New Ind. Ant.*, I, 62–68; etc.

[97] *Bhagavadgītā*, Poona, 1941, intro.; 'The so called Kashmirian Recension' in *New Ind. Ant.*, II, 211–51; 'Bhagavadgītā Riddle Unriddled' in *ABORI*, XIX, 335–48; 'The Rāmānujiya text' in *Annals of Venkateswara Oriental Institute*, I, 7–15; also Bhiṣmaparvan of the *Mbk.*, Critical ed., Poona, 1945–47.

under the title 'Critical Exposition of the Argument'. According to him, "the triune-unity of *karma*, *jñāna* and *bhakti* as set forth by the poem demanded on the part of the author a good deal of special pleading with a view to constitute an alliance between an orthodox Mīmāṃsists with his old-world *yajña* as the be-all and end-all of existence, the post-Upaniṣadic Sāṅkhya with its dominating passion for saṃnyāsa, pre-Patañjali yoga with its mystic discipline of self culture tempered by a deistic cosmology and an intellectualistic ethics, and various *bhakti* cults of the day with their special notions of the deity and the special modes and methods of its worship". He also held that the *Bhagavadgītā* was "an effort on a great scale put forth by the older Śrauta religion, with its institution of *yajña* and Varṇāśrama, to hold its own and to stem the gathering tide of heretic and agnostic speculations". *Bhagavadgītā*: *The Song of God* (Madras, 1945) was an English translation in prose and verse, which was not literal but interpretative and based on all classical commentaries, by Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Isherwood with an introduction by Aldous Huxley. S. Radhakrishnan's *The Bhagavadgītā* (London, 1948) contained the text in Roman script, an introductory essay, English translation and notes. The introductory dealt with the importance of the work, date and text, chief commentators, ultimate reality, Kṛṣṇa the teacher, the status of the world and the concept of *māyā*, the individual self, Yoga-śāstra, *jñāna* or saving wisdom, the way of knowledge, the way of devotion, the way of action and the goal.

It should be pointed out in this connection that the *Gītā* served as a very effective weapon to the cause of the Indian national awakening and social reforms. It inspired hundred of Indian youths to offer their lives in the gallows during the freedom movement. It was not the devotional aspect, but Kṛṣṇa's exhortation to Arjuna to fight selflessly the righteous battle, the Karmayoga, the work for others without any feeling of personal gain that attracted the imagination of Svāmī Vivekānanda, Balgangadhar Tilak, Mahatma Gandhi and other masterminds of modern India who interpreted the *Gītā* as a guide to action. Svāmī Vivekānanda wrote profusely on the *Gītā*, the teachings of which, according to him, comprised the loftiest of the human ideals.[98] To him devotion to God was of secondary importance. In his own words: "We are

[98]See his *Works* published by the Ramakrishna Mission.

responsible for what we are; and whatever we wish ourselves to be; we have the power to make ourselves.... To advance we must have faith in ourselves and then in God". Annie Besant summarised the teachings of the *Gītā* thus: "Have no personal interest in the event; carry out the duty imposed by the position of life; realise that Īśvara, at once the Lord and Law, is the doer working out the mighty evolution that ends in bliss and peace; be identified with Him by devotion and then perform duty as duty, fighting without passion or desire, without anger or hatred".[99]

Balgangadhar Tilak's monumental commentary on the *Bhagavadgītā* was known as the *Gītārahasya* or *Karmayogaśāstra* in which he insisted that the concept of *karma* was not used in the *Bhagavadgītā* in the restricted sense of actions prescribed by the Śrutis and Smṛtis; it included all activities required to be undertaken by virtue of one's position in life and calculated to promote the interests of society.[100] Aurobindo's *Essays on the Gita*[101] sought to interpret the *Gītā* not as a philosophical doctrine, but as a practical guide to life, to the highest spiritual life which was not a turning away from the world and its actualities, nor a pursuit of mere ethical or mentally motivated activities, but a life of a greater vision and understanding. To him Arjuna was the "type of the struggling human soul who has not yet received the knowledge, but has grown fit to receive it by action in the world in a close companionship and an increasing nearness to the higher and divine Self in humanity". The *Bhagavadgītā* also inspired Mahatma Gandhi to form the concept of his non-violent struggle against injustice and oppression. His *Anasaktiyoga* was the interpretative translation of the *Bhagavadgītā* in Gujarati,[102] He asserted that *karmayoga* was the

[99]*The Bhagavadgītā or the Lord's Sayings*, Madras, 1909, V.

[100]It was translated into Bengali from the original Marathi by Jyotindranath Tagore (along with his own interpretations) in 1924. Its English version was made by B.C. Sukthankar which was published from Poona in 1935.

[101]First Series, Calcutta, 1922; second series, Calcutta, 1928. Anil Baran Roy's *Śrimadbhagavadgītā* (in Bengali, Calcutta, 1941) was based on Aurobindo's philosophy and faithfully followed Aurobindo's thought. Its introduction dealt with the interpretation of classical commentators like Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja and thinkers like Rāmakṛṣṇa and Tilak. See also his *The Message of the Gītā as interpreted by Sri Aurobindo*, London, 1946.

[102]Its English version was published by Mahadev Desai under the title *The Gospel of Selfless Action or the Gītā according to Gandhi*, Ahmedabad, 1946. For Gandhiji's approach to the *Gītā* see also V.G. Desai's *Discourses on the Gītā*; Vinoba Bhave's *Talks on*

centre round which devotion, knowledge and the rest revolved in the *Gītā*. The central message of the *Gītā* according to Gandhiji was that "no knowledge is to be found without seeking, no tranquillity without travail, no happiness except through tribulation. Every seeker has, at one time or another, to pass through a conflict of duties, a heart-churning".

In his *Bhagavadgītā: A Study* (Poona, 1928), D.D. Vadekar made a plea for the historical study and interpretation of the *Gītā*. Vadekar was critical in regard to Śaṅkara's interpretation. According to him the *Gītā* was the synthesis of Rāmānuja's qualified monism and Tilak's activism. M.N. Sircar's *Mysticism in Bhagavadgītā* (Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, 1929) held that contrary to the divergence between knowledge and faith felt in Europe, thought, knowledge and faith were not in conflict in India where mysticism had its right place and science was not divorced from it. The central teaching of the *Gītā*, like that of the Upaniṣads was confined to the brahman, the Being, the conception of the transcendence and immanence. The teachings were discussed under four categories, namely, the philosophic tendencies, the descent of the soul, the ascent of the soul and the spiritual fulfilment. The mystic ideal of the *Gītā* was stated to be the realization of the Divine in its immanence and transcendence, the Divine in man and nature and the Divine beyond and above them. V.G. Rele in his *Bhagavadgītā* (Bombay, 1930) expounded the *Gītā* on the basis of psycho-philosophy and psycho-analysis. P.N. Srinivasachari expounded the ethical aspect of the *Bhagavadgītā* in the light of Rāmānuja's Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda by adopting Western methods of critical enquiry.

Rudolf Otto published three works on the *Bhagavadgītā* in 1934–35.[103] According to him, the present contents of the *Gītā* have nothing to do with its original form. They consist mainly of tracts emanating from writers of different schools and foisted on to the original work. He found three distinct strata in the *Bhagavadgītā*: the first in the original poem which, according to him consisted of only 133 verses; the second in the doctrinal tracts; and the third in the additions and glosses that came to be inserted later on. The

Gītā (Eng. trans. of *Gītāpravacana*), London, 1960; Gandhiji's *Gītā: My Mother*, ed. by A.T. Hingorani, Bombay, 1965; A.T. Hingorani, *Teachings of the Gītā*, Bombay, 1971.

[103] *Bhagavadgītā: Der Sang der Her-Habenen*, Stuttgart, 1935; *Die Urgestalt der Bhagavadgītā*, Tubingen, 1934; *Die Lehrtraktate der Bhagavadgītā*, Tubingen, 1935; Eng. trans.: *Original Bhagavadgītā, The Song of the Exalted One*, by J.E. Turner, London, 1939.

views of Otto were criticised by Belvalkar who held that the *Gītā* in its present form, though not a unitary poem was transformed into a philosophical synthesis and as such beyond the scope of any stratification.[104] Even before Otto, Jarl Charpenter attempted to make a chronological stratification of the contents of the *Bhagavadgītā*. He placed the earlier portion somewhere about 200 BC and the later portions after an interval of several centuries.[105] Schrader also tried to bring out certain interpolated passages.[106] S.K. De insisted on two points: the date and the process of remodelling. As to the first, he held it to be the earliest of all the existing works of devotional character. As to the second, he was of opinion that the *Gītā* suffered from occasional interpolations, but to maintain that the work was a poor patchwork or to deny that it was a powerful synthetic expression of a particular trend of religious thought was to miss the essential significance of the poem, as well as to go directly against the testimony of Indian tradition which had always attempted, even from different point of view, a synthetic interpretation of the poem as a whole.[107]

N.V. Thadani in his *Bhagavadgītā* (Karachi, 1936) held that the *Gītā* was a logical step showing a progression of ideas from the Sāṅkhya to the Vedānta through the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the Yoga and thus trying to correlate the different systems of philosophy. D.S. Sarma in his Lectures on the *Bhagavadgītā* (Rajahmundry, 1937) tried to make an idealistic analysis of its contents and suggest that its main emphasis was on love or *bhakti*. W. Kirfel's Index to the *Bhagavadgītā* (Leipzig, 1938) was an alphabetical *pada* index of the *Gītā* based on various editions. Fifty-four *padas* appear twice or repeatedly; according to Kirfel, "the majority of these repetitions is certainly without importance, but some seem to be the last traces of former joints of the text". Krishna Prem in his *Yoga of Bhagavadgītā* (London, 1938) tried to suggest that the *Gītā* was not an intellectual formation, but a mighty synthesis of the partial spheres of different yogas, integrating every aspect of the divine nature of all beings. P. Narasimham in his *Gītā: A Critique* (Madras, 1939) suggested that the *Gītā* actually presented a philosophy of brah-

[104] 'Miscarriage of Attempted Stratification of the B.G.' in *Journal of the University of Bombay*, V, 63–133.

[105] 'Some Remarks on the B.G.' in *Ind. Ant.*, 1930, 46–50, 77–80, 101–05, 121–26.

[106] *IHQ*, V, 173–81, 790–91.

[107] *Indian Culture*, IX, 31–35.

man for the masses. While the Upaniṣads presented the concept of brahman from a purely theoretical view point, which was made for the seekers and the learned, the author of the *Gītā* insisted on the popular adaptability of the most sophisticated concept in daily walks of life. Among other important studies of the thirties, mention may be made of Sivananda Swami's *Bhagavadgītā* (Tehri Garhwal, 1939) which contained word-to-word meaning, translation and commentary. T.M.P. Mahadevan in his *Two-fold Path in the Gītā* (Madras, 1940) gave an elucidation of the main theme of Śaṅkara's viewpoint that the *Gītā* taught two separate paths in two separate kinds of persons and did not advocate the combination of knowledge and action in one and the same person.

S.C. Roy's *The Bhagavadgītā and Modern Scholarship* (London, 1941) was the first attempt at a comprehension of the result of researches on the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Mahābhārata* in which the views of Max Müller, Hopkins, Barth, Humboldt, Weber, Holtzmann, Dhalmann, Schröder, Deussen, Garbe, Winternitz, Macnicol, Bhandarkar, Tilak, Bankimchandra, Subba Rao, Vaidya and many others were critically reviewed. In his subsequent *The Bhagavadgītā and its Background* (1944) he suggested that the text of the *Gītā* remained substantially unaltered, that it was linked with the thoughts of the Upaniṣads and associated more with the Vedānta philosophy than with the Sāṅkhya-Yoga, that the teachings of the *Gītā* were not the same as those of the Nārāyaṇīya section of the Great Epic, that it was not written by any sectarian poet and that it was meant to be a sacred code of devotion, philosophical insight, moral and religious culture, universally acceptable to all irrespective of caste, creed and colour. In a concise dictionary of the *Gītā* brought out by L.R. Gokhale under the title *Śrīmad-Bhagavadgītā Laghukośa* (Poona, 1944) the grammatical characteristic of its words, cross-references to connected words, their explanations by Śaṅkara and his followers in the commentaries, their occurrences in different places of the text and their meanings in English, Hindi and Marathi were given. R.V. Row in his *Introduction to the Study of the Bhagavadgītā* (Madras, 1946) cited the pertinent passages in subjectwise arrangement throwing light on their practical application in different walks on life. P.C. Divanji in his *Word-Index to the Bhagavadgītā* (Bombay, 1947) divided the words of the *Gītā* into three categories, viz., primary word units, secondary word units and the common basic forms. K.M. Munshi's

Bhagavadgītā and Modern Life (Bombay, 1947) consisted of seven lectures comprising the following topics: Place and meaning of the *Gītā*; therefore do thou resist, O Arjuna; the unity which is yoga; *svabhāva*, the basis of perfection; *Cāturvarṇa*, its ideal and practice; yoga is perfection in action; and *brahmacarya*, sublimation of the sex urge.

Diwan Chand's *Short Studies in the Bhagavadgītā* (Bombay, 1951) was an analysis of the *Gītā* from a purely philosophical point of view. To this category belonged H.V. Divatia's *Art of Life in the Bhagavadgītā* (Bombay, 1951) in which psychology, epistemology, cosmology, metaphysics and ethics of the *Gītā* were discussed. P.D. Gune in his *Articles on Bhagavadgītā* (Poona, 1952) tried to prove that the central message of the *Gītā* was the doctrine of absolute devotion to the supreme being and a vigorous protest against Brahminical ritualism. M.P. Chitale in his *Bhagavadgītā and Hindu Dharma* (Poona, 1953) tried to explain the principles of the Hindu religion and the essentials of religious practice and conduct as taught in the *Gītā*. A.D. Pusalker's *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas* (Bombay, 1953) provided a substantial portion in dealing with the researches on the *Bhagavadgītā*. The ethical approach of the *Gītā* was dealt elaborately in Sivananda Swami's *Ethics of the Bhagavadgītā* (Hrisikesh, 1957). The most significant work of the fifties was R.D. Ranade's *The Bhagavadgītā as a Philosophy of God-realization being a clue to the Labrynth of Modern Interpretations* (Nagpur, 1959). The prolonged title was self-explanatory, and Ranade's competence to deal with such a vast affair was beyond all doubts. According to him, the general upshot of the teaching of the *Gītā* is the worship of the relative aspect of brahman in the form of a personal God or the Saguṇa-*upāsanā* and not the Avyakta-*upāsanā* in which the Brahman is considered to be absolute, impersonel, formless, ultimate reality and the truth-conscious bliss combine, and the former is evidently a better method of worship. Many useful articles on the *Gītā* were also published between the thirties and the fifties written by eminent scholars.[108]

[108]V. Raghavan, 'The Bhāgavatapurāṇa and the Bhagavadgītā' in *Journal of Oriental Research*, XII, 71 ff.; 'Bhagavadgītā and Jain literature' in *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, X, 80–87; cf. Gode in *ABORI*, XX, 188–94; Rajawade, 'Grammar of the Gītā' in *Bhandarkar Com. Vol.*, 325–38 and its review by B.N. Krishnamurti Sarma in *ABORI*, XI, 284–99; Gode, 'Comparisons in the Bhagavadgītā' in *ABORI*, II, 135–42; 'Bhakti Sūtras of Nārada and the Bhagavadgītā' in ibid., IV, 63–95. 'Psychology of emotions as represented in

Thus we find that apart from the textual analysis, editions, translations and studies based on the earlier commentators most works on the *Gītā* were inspired from a purely subjective outlook. Their authors wanted to find support from the *Gītā* what they themselves believed and sought to preach and practice. The Marxist writers also fell victim of this pure subjectivism and sought to find in the evils of class society and a philosophy that sought to sustain and perpetuate it. D.D. Kosambi, for example, in his article entitled 'Social and Economic Aspects of the Bhagavadgītā' which formed a chapter of his *Myth and Reality* (Bombay, 1962) sharply criticised the *Gītā* pointing out its contradictions and class Orientation without caring for the canons of Marxist literary, historical and religious criticism. He concluded without showing any valid historical ground that this 'most intricate three-hour discourse on moral philosophy' was prepared for the upper classes by the Brahmins and only through them for others. He found fault with it for not bringing about any fundamental change in the means of production, for its ethical system which was 'sandwiched with pure superstition', for its 'slippery opportunism' and 'disdain for logical consistency'. A personal view with Marxist jargons does not mean Marxist historiography. It is surprising that as a Marxist historian he did not care to explain why and how, notwithstanding all its inconsistencies and contradictions the *Gītā* was able to offer even a 'false' illusion of a cherished reality to the masses of all ranks throughout the ages. Likewise P.N. Bazaz in his *The Role of Bhagavadgītā in Indian History* (New Delhi, 1975) held that the *Gītā* was meant for creating frustration and confusion in a man instead of making him wise and preserving the established old order from which only the upper classes benefited. According to him the philosophy of devotion to a personal god reflected the

the Bhagavadgītā' *QJMS*, 1924; A.N. Ray, 'Śrīkṛṣṇa as the Source of the BG' in *IHQ*, IX, 188–96; T.M.P. Mahadevan, 'Is Gītā a Gospel of War' in *Philosophical Quarterly*, XVII, 1941, 'The Original Gītā' in *Hiriyanna Com. Vol.*, 101–08; K.M. Munshi, 'Experimental approach to the Gītā' in *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, III, 1–20; P.C. Divanji, 'Authorship and date of the BG' in *Siddha Bhāratī*, II, 151–56; S.K. Belvalkar, 'Two mishandled passages from the BG' in *Hiriyanna Com. Vol.*, 1–11; 'BG: Trichotomy versus Triune-Unity' in *Karmarkar Vol.*, 1–6; 'Abhijñāna-śākuntala and the BG' in *Raja Com. Vol.*, 48–54; P.M. Modi, 'BG: Its teaching and the Harmony of its Adhyayas' in *Dhruva Com. Vol.*, III, 51–56; S.K. Dikshit, 'Was the BG known to Megasthenes?' in *ABORI*, XXX, 298–315; M. Yamunacharya, 'Evolution of the Monotheistic Conceptions in the BG' in *QJMS*, XXXV, 1945; S.K. Maitra, 'Idea of conflict in the BG' in *Rangaswami Com. Vol.*, 517–38; etc.

political theory of dictatorship. S.G. Sardesai and Dilip Bose in their *Marxism and Bhagavadgītā* went a step further. According to Sardesai, the *Gītā* was a "very important ideological weapon of Indian reaction for fighting all progressive and radical forces by injecting superstitions, mystical and fatalist ideas and even communal poison in the mind of the people". Within the basic framework of the reactionary theories of *ātman*, Brahman, *karma*, *mokṣa*, etc. developed by the Upaniṣads which aimed at creating a class-divided exploitative and oppressive social structure the *Gītā* "modified and synthesised various subsequent traditions and views to suit the contemporary practical and ideological requirements of the property-owning governing classes". Among some Marxist or near-Marxist scholars it had also become a fashion to connect the *Bhagavadgītā* with feudalism with the oversimplified theory that the ideology of *bhakti* was well-suited for sustaining a feudalistic socio-political structure since it reflected the complete dependence of the tenants or semi-serfs on the landlords.[109]

G.S. Khair in his *Quest for the Original Gītā* (Bombay, 1969) held that out of the thirty-five most important subject dealt with in the text a large number are repeated twice or thrice and about eight subjects are repeated five or six times. R.C. Zaehner in his *Bhagavadgītā* (Oxford, 1969) dated the text some time between the fifth and second centuries BC and found some Buddhist inspiration behind its composition. He held that knowledge imported in the *Bhagavadgītā* was not sensory or intellectual; it was intuitive, enabling one to know the highest truth. The same was also the conclusion of K.N. Upadhyaya who in his *Early Buddhism and the Bhagavadgītā* (Delhi, 1971) held that seven emotional impediments of knowledge—desire, anger, greed, attachment, hatred, delusion and fear—had to be overcome for having a clear vision of truth. The Buddha likewise spoke of ending sorrow through his eightfold path. He also thought that action, knowledge and devotion were treated in the *Gītā* not as compartmentalised or competing but complementary parts merging in one another and leading

[109]Cf. Kosambi, op. cit., 29 ff.; Suvira Jaiswal, *The Origin and Development of Vaisnavism*, Delhi, 1967 (Sec. ed., 1981), 121–22; R.S. Sharma in *Indian Historical Review*, I, 1974, 9; V.K. Thakur, 'Social Roots of the Bhagavadgītā' in *Indologica Taurinensia*, X, 1982, 289–300; see also M.G.S. Narayanan and V.Kesavan in S.C. Malik ed., *Indian Movements: Some Aspects of Dissent, Protest and Reform*, (Simla, 1978, 33–66., rep. in D.N. Jha. ed., *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987.

to the same goal of liberation. Georg Feuerstein in his *The Bhagavadgītā: A Critical Rendering* (New Delhi, 1980) asserted that the *Gītā* did not propound a compromise philosophy, but offered a genuine creative synthesis. Among the important textual publications of the eighties mention should be made of Sastri G.S. Sadhale's *The Bhagavadgītā with Eleven Commentaries* (3 vols.) and R. Gotshalk's *The Bhagavadgītā: Translation and Commentary*, both published from Delhi in 1985. G.V. Saroja's *Tilak and Śaṅkara on the Gītā* (New Delhi, 1985) was a critical study of Tilak's *Gītārahasya* in the light of Śaṅkara's Commentary on the *Gītā*. The author sought to prove that the concept of *jñāna-karma-samuccaya* was inconsistent with that of *advaya*. Tilak considered yoga or *niṣṭhā* as different from *mārga* (the ways of *bhakti* and *jñāna*). His *karmayoga* was equal to the addition of *niṣkāma-karma* to Sāṅkhya-Yoga, which formula forced him to end up in two types of *sthitaprajñas*. In this work attempt was made to refute Tilak's contention that the *Gītā* was a treatise on ethics or a Karma-Yoga-Śāstra and uphold Śaṅkara's assertion that it was a *mokṣaśāstra* or science of liberation with emphasis on the four chief tenets of Advaita-Nirguṇa Brahman, *māyā*, *vivartavāda* and *jīvanmukti*. Jñāna, the fifth and the last concept which was the finale of Śaṅkara alone was viewed as opposed to Tilak's concept of the synthesis of knowledge and action. Aravind Sharma's *The Hindu Gītā: Ancient and Classical Interpretations of the Bhagavadgītā* (London, 1986) was another significant modern contribution to the study of the *Gītā*.

Vivekanand Jha's 'Social Content of the Bhagavadgītā'[110] contained, besides the subject matter suggested in the title, important views on different aspects of the *Gītā* of eminent scholars whose contributions enriched our knowledge and opened new horizons in the field of the study of this 'unusual and remarkable' work of ancient Indian literature. In the introductory section the author had dealt with the background and perspective and in the following sections with *karmayoga*, *varṇa* and *jāti*, *jñānayoga*, *bhaktiyoga* and its attitude towards the classes. In extensive footnotes he presented the divergent views of different scholars on each of the topics mentioned above and tried to make a balanced assessment of its contents without any special theoretical preoccupation. In the labrynth of interpretations and conflicting views by which the *Gītā* was characterised through the ages it offered certain clues

[110] *Indian Historical Review*, XI, 1985, 1–44.

within a reasonable space to the understanding of the intricacies involved therein, agreeing at least with one point of Kosambi that "the Gītā is honoured more often than read, and understood less than it is recited".

III

Before dealing with the other epic and the Purāṇas we shall turn to the *Harivaṃśa* and some articles referring to both the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Although the *Harivaṃśa* is regarded as a *khila* or supplement of the *Mahābhārata*, it has really nothing to do with the great epic. It is a collection of the Puranic type meant for the glorification of Viṣṇu and his incarnation Kṛṣṇa. As early as in 1834–35 it was translated into French by S.A. Langlois. A. Holtzman (1892) in his study of the *Mahābhārata* dealt with the nature of the text.[111] Extracts from this text were provided by E.W. Hopkins[112] and an overall treatment was made by M. Winternitz.[113] Farquhar considered the *Harivaṃśa* as a cent per cent Purāṇa meant for popularising the monotheistic Vaiṣṇavism.[114] Ruben thought that the original supplement of the *Mahābhārata* was much shorter than the *Khila-Harivaṃśa* now current, that the *Harivaṃśa* was the oldest Purāṇa and that the original archetype of the *Harivaṃśa* was better preserved in the *Brahma-Purāṇa*.[115] R. Kinjawadekar's edition of the *Harivaṃśa* came out in 1936. Its religious importance was long recognised as was attested by its Persian translation and regional versions, as well as an old Javanese recension. Although used frequently for studies on different aspects of Indian religion, the text did not receive sufficient attention of the scholars. It has no special historical literature of its own like the *Mahābhārata* or the *Bhagavadgītā*, though it has a great antiquity and contains no less than 16,374 verses.

It is generally agreed by the scholars that the period of the composition of the *Mahābhārata* from the collection of the Bhārata lays to the introduction of the later books comprised no less than 800 years, from 400 BC to AD 400, and that the *Rāmāyaṇa* began to be composed on the basis of ancient ballads from about 300 BC which

[111] *Das Mahābhārata*, II, 272–98.

[112] *Festschrift Windisch*, 68 ff.

[113] *HIL*, I, 443–54.

[114] *Outline of Indian Religious Literatures*, London, 1920, 139.

[115] *JAOS*, LXI, 115–27; *JRAS*, 1941, 247–56.

was completed in its present from towards the close of AD 200. Obviously the earlier forms of the *Mahābhārata* had a great impact on the composition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which in its turn had influenced the composition of the later versions of the Mahābhārata. As such, the interrelation between the two epics can hardly be overlooked. The discussion on the interrelation of the two epics was initiated by Ludwig and Dahlmann. *The Great Epic of India* by Hopkins dealt, inter alia, with the relation of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* and other problems connected with both the epics. Hopkins had referred to the allusions of the Rāma story in the *Mahābhārata* and given 62 references in all.[116] He also mentioned the features common to both the epics referring to the metre, tales, genealogies, phraseology, etc.[117] He had further dealt with 'Parallel Features in the two Epics' and 'Proverbs and Tales common to the two Epics'.[118] As early as in 1893 H. Jacobi in his *Das Rāmāyaṇa* suggested that the 'Rāmopākhyāna' (the story of Rāma) of the *Mahābhārata* was based on the *Ramāyaṇa*. This view was contested by Macdonell and Hopkins. Sukthankar in his 'Rāmophākhyāna and Rāmāyaṇa' substantiated Jacobi's view and gave a concordance of parallel passages in the *Mahābhārata* and *Rāmāyaṇa* numbering 82, which suggested, contrary to Hopkins, that the Rāmopākhyāna was an epitome of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.[119] H.C. Raychaudhuri in his 'Interrelation of the Epics' examined the views of Hopkins and Macdonell and demonstrated features common to both epics.[120] V.N. Aiyar[121] and Sukthankar[122] made comparative studies of the Nalopākhyāna of the *Mahābhārata* and its parallels in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. W. Rüben had given parallel phrases of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata* in appendix V to his text.[123] Comparative studies of the two epics were also made by N.N. Ghosh, P.N. Mullick, T.R. Venkatarama Sastri, V.V. Dixit and others.

N.A. Gore's *Bibliography of the Rāmāyaṇa* (Poona, 1943) provided a detailed information about the various text-editions, translations,

[116] *JAOS*, L, 85–103.

[117] *Cambridge History of India*, I, 251 ff.

[118] *American Journal of Philology*, XIX, 138–51; XX, 22–39.

[119] *Festschrift Kane*, 482–87.

[120] *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, Calcutta, 1932, 25–34.

[121] *Journal of Oriental Research*, XI, no. 1.

[122] *Festschrift Thomas*, 294–303.

[123] *Studien Zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa*, Stuttgart, 1936.

epitomes and abridgements of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and listed books and papers on the *Rāmāyaṇa* from Indological journals with useful extracts from important books and papers. The problems connected with the critical text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* were dealt with by Ruben in his *Studien Zur Textgeschichte des Rāmāyaṇa*, (Stuttgart, 1936) and the story of preparation of the critical edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa* was narrated in detail by A.D. Pusalker in his *Epics and Purāṇas* (Bombay, 1955). The *Rāmāyaṇa* was translated into English verse by R.T.H. Griffith (in 5 vols., 1870–74); in one volume, Benares, 1895),[124] into English prose by M.N. Dutt (Calcutta, 1892–94) and in abridged form in English by R.C. Dutt (London, 1900).[125] As early as in 1892 R. Rice translated the Kannada *Pampa-Rāmāyaṇa* into English. Studies in the *Rāmāyaṇa* were initiated by Lassen who discussed the problems of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and pointed to the development of the Rāma story in four stages, suggesting that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was an allegorical representation of the Aryan conquest of the south.[126] Lassen was followed by Weber, Muir, Friedrich and Monier-Williams.

Weber's critical remarks on the *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts were of great help to the Critical editors of the text. Like Lassen he also held that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was composed to account for the spread of Aryan culture to the south and to Ceylon.[127] He also held that the *Rāmāyaṇa* was inspired by the work of Homer—a view which was severelly contested by Telang, Jacobi, Hopkins, Vaidya and others.[128] Jacobi in his *Das Rāmāyaṇa* (Bonn, 1893) made the most elaborate treatment of the text. His work discussed several problems such as the genesis of the different recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and their relation to one another; the problem of interpolations; origin and development; Buddhist and Greek influence; age, language and the poetic; and the saga itself. According to Jacobi, the *Rāmāyaṇas* originally comprised only five books (II–VI),

[124] New ed. with a memoir by M.N. Venkataswami, Banares, 1915.

[125] Italian tr. by G. Gerrasio, Parigi, 1847–48; into French by H. Fauche, Paris; 1854–58 and by A. Roussel, Paris, 1903–9; German tr. in parts by J. Menrad, München 1897 and a few extracts by Fr. Rückert (1878); Outline of the story by J.C. Oman (1899); For full account and details: H. Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn, 1893. An English translation in prose in 3 vols. by H.P. Shastri came out from London in 1952–59.

[126] *Ind. Alt.*, I, 505.

[127] 'Uber das Rāmāyaṇa' in *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie*, 1870.

[128] Cf. K.T. Telang, *Was Rāmāyaṇa Copied from Homer?* Bombay, 1873.

the first and seventh being later addition. Though these additions were effected before the different recensions arose, the transformation of the original tribal hero into the national hero and his identification with Viṣṇu indicated the passage of a considerable time between the composition of the original poem and that of the original matter. Alexander Baumgartner's *Das Rāmāyaṇa und die Rāma Literatur der Inder* (Freiburg, 1894) discussed the development of the Rāma story and the Rāma literature in Indian languages. Hopkins in his *The Great Epic of India* (New York, 1901) held that like the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* was the property of the whole Indian people, the recitation of which was supposed to confer religious merit on the reciter. Both epics abounded in numerous Brahmanical myths and legends which frequently interrupted the thread of the narrative. There was a close resemblance not only in style, expression and descriptions as exemplified by parallel passages, indential similes and descriptions, and also in the mythology and philosophy of the epics. The evolution and transformation of certain Vedic myths, especially those connected with Sītā, in the *Rāmāyaṇa* were taken into account by Weber and Jacobi. Julius Negelin in his 'Outline of Rāma-Sītā legend' (1962) had dealt with its Vedic infrastructure.[129] T.W. Rhys Davids on the basis of the Buddhist *Dasaratha Jātaka* held that the *Rāmāyaṇa* could not have existed as an epic at the time of the origin of these Buddha-ballads. (*Buddhist India*, London, 1903, 183)—a view which was not accepted by most scholars who opined that there were many floating Rāma legends, apart from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and that the author of the *Dasaratha Jātaka* might have made one such legend the source of his work. C.V. Vaidya's *The Riddle of the Rāmāyaṇa* (Bombay, 1906) dealt with various problems regarding the text and its contents and also with the inconsistencies in the approach of the Western scholars towards the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Winternitz who made a detailed study of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in 1907 (German original of the *HIL*)[130] raised three important questions. Which of the two epics, in the form in which they are now before us, is the older? What relation does the period of time in which an original *Mahābhārata* epic gradually became the great *compilation* combining heroic songs and didactic poetry, bear to that period of time in which the *ancient poem of Vālmīki* became enlarged into the

[129] *Wiener Zeitschrift*, XVI, 226 ff.

[130] Eng. version 1927, I, 475–517.

present *Rāmāyaṇa* by means of greater or smaller additions in the older books, and finally by the addition of Books I and VII? Was there, generally speaking, a *Mahābhārata* epic or a *Rāmāyaṇa* epic first in existence? As to the first he said that our present *Rāmāyaṇa* was older than the *Mahābhārata* in its present form. As to the second he said that since the period of the growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa* fell within the longer period of the development of the *Mahābhārata* the interpolated extra matters of the latter naturally made their way into the former. As to the third he said that the general Hindu argument that since the incarnation of Viṣṇu as Rāma preceded that of Kṛṣṇa, the *Rāmāyaṇa* must be older, could not be held as valid because Rāma was not mentioned by Pāṇini and Patañjali and in the inscriptions of the pre-Christian era. Jacobi's argument that the *Rāmāyaṇa* only became an epic under the influence of the poetic art of Vālmīki went beyond what was warranted by facts. Regarding the *Rāmāyaṇa* Hopkins observed: "Whatever may have been the date of its germ as a story, as an art-product it is later than the *Mahābhārata*". Winternitz also held the theory of the Buddhist influence on Rāmāyaṇa as baseless.

D.C. Sen in his *Bengali Rāmāyaṇas* (Calcutta, 1920) held that none of the Bengali *Rāmāyaṇas* were translations of the Sanskrit epic, but each author told his story in his own way weaving into it his own thoughts and ancient traditions current in the neighbourhood. After the Vaiṣṇava revival of Caitanya, later writers filled their poems with Vaiṣṇava doctrines and with theories about *bhakti*. It was the first systematic attempt of the studies in regional *Rāmāyaṇas*. A comparative study of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the Anglo-Saxon epic *Beowulf* was made by I.S. Peter in 1924. One author under the pseudonym Maharasthriya composed *Rāmāyaṇa Samālocanā* in Marathi (Poona, 1927) which contained a foreword of J.S. Karandikar. In this volume apart from a thorough historical survey of Vālmīki's work the author had dealt with some other versions of the Rāma story as found in the *Ānanda-Rāmāyaṇa*, *Adhyātma Rāmāyaṇa*, *Rāmacaritmānasa*, etc. The English translation of Chikyo Yamamota's *Rāmāyaṇa in China* was published in 1938 which year also saw the Polish publication of E. Sluszkeiwicz's *Przyczynki do Badan nad Dziejami Redakcyj Ramayany*. In this work the author quoted similar passages in parallel columns from the different recensions of the Rāma story. K.S. Ramaswami Sastri's *Studies in the Rāmāyaṇa* (Baroda, 1944) presented in the first part the life and

work of Vālmīki and in the second part discussed in detail some of the riddles of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with their solutions. N.R. Navalkar's *A New Approach to the Rāmāyaṇa* (Jabalpur, 1947) was a general study on different aspects of the great epic. W. Stuttenheim's *Rāma Legenden und Rāma Reliefs in Indonesien* (Berlin, 1948) dealt with the Rāma legends of Indonesia and their representation in visual art. V.S. Srinivasa Sastri's *Lectures on the Rāmāyaṇa* (Madras, 1949) were critical and analytical studies of the different characters in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and contained copious quotation from the text and numerous references to commentaries with discussions thereon. C. Bulcke's *Rāmakathā* (in Hindi, Allahabad, 1950) dealt with the Rāma legends as found in the Vedic literature, in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, in the *Mahābhārata*, Buddhist and Jain literature, in Sanskrit religious and secular literature, in modern Indian languages and in other countries such as Tibet, Indonesia, Indo-China and Europe. Besides other discussions on the sources, interpolations, points of unity and divergences, etc. there was an appendix given in a tabular analysis of the Rāmakathā literature in six columns and an upto date bibliography on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. V.V. Subramanya Aiyar's *Kamba-Rāmāyaṇa* (New Delhi, 1950) and Sudha Mazumdar's *Rāmāyaṇa* (2 vols. based on Kṛttivāsa's Bengali version, Bombay, 1953) were important studies on regional *Rāmāyaṇas* to which might be added K. Chandrasekharan's *Rāmāyaṇa Tribeṇī* (Madras, 1953) which was a comparative study of the Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki, Tamil *Rāmāyaṇa* of Kamban and Hindi *Rāmāyaṇa* (*Rāmacaritmānasa*) of Tulsīdās. Balarāma Dāsa's Oriya *Rāmāyaṇa* was rendered into English by M. Moagalaba (Delhi, 1966) and that of Tulsīdās by A.G. Atkins (Calcutta, 1970).

Despite numerous publications on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the religious contents of the text did not receive as much attention of the scholars as is ought to have been, especially in view of the universal equation of Rāma with Viṣṇu and the existence of an extensive Rāma cult as a specific development of monotheistic bhaktism all over India. The only work which deserved special mention in this connection was Benjamin Khan's *The Concept of Dharma in Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa* (Delhi, 1965). Glimpses of religious life as recorded in the *Rāmāyaṇa* were also found in S.N. Vyas's *Rāmāyaṇa-kālīn Samāj* (in Hindi, 1964) and *India in the Rāmāyaṇa Age* (Delhi, 1967). S.C. De's *Historicity of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Indo-Aryan Society of India and Ceylon* (Delhi, 1976) contained only occasional references. S.K.

Chatterji's *The Rāmāyaṇa: Its Character, Genesis, History, Expansion, Exodus: A Resumé* (Calcutta, 1978), as its title implied, contained various interesting topics. Chatterji believed that the Rāma epic in its present form was made by welding of various elements into a composite mass in which the pre-Aryan and non-Aryan elements, relics of which were preserved in its religious and ritualistic aspects, had significant presence. He also insisted on his pet theory that the concept of *bhakti* and the allied ritual of *pūjā* were of pre-Aryan origin. J.L. Brocklington's *Righteous Rāma: The Evolution of an Epic* (Delhi, 1984) showed how the *Rāmāyaṇa*, like the even more exhaustive *Mahābhārata*, reflected a changing culture. In its different layers the *Rāmāyaṇa* revealed the last stage of the Vedic religion, exemplified in particular by the early prominence of Indra, followed by the rise and eclipse of a relatively short-lived importance of Brahmā, which gave way in the last stage to an incipient Vaiṣṇavism. New light was thus thrown in this work on the transition between the religion of the Vedas and later Hinduism. A. Sarkar's *A Study on the Rāmāyaṇas* (Calcutta, 1987) was based on a critical study of different *Rāmāyaṇas* of Indian and trans-Indian origin. Though it dealt mainly with the historical and literary aspects, the philosophical and symbolical aspects were not also overlooked. In the chapter under the title 'Allegory' certain religio-philosophical concepts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* were sought to be interpreted.

IV

The first European scholar who took note of the Purāṇas in his *Researches into the Nature and Affinity of Ancient and Hindu Mythology* (London, 1831) was V. Kennedy, but it was H.H. Wilson who in his *Essays on Sanskrit Literature* (London, 1832) and in the 'Introduction' and 'Notes' to his translation of the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (London, 1840) made a thorough study of these texts and opened a new horizon of historical research.[131] Valuable service was also rendered to the Puranic investigation by E. Burnouf in his preface to the edition and French translation of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (Paris, 1840–98).[132] There are 18 Mahā-Purāṇas and 18 Upa-Purāṇas

[131]For Wilson's services to the investigation of the Purāṇas, cf. Windisch, *Geschichte du Sanskrit Philologie*, 41 ff. Wilson's *Purāṇas: An Account of their Contents and Nature* was published by Society for Resuscitation of Indian Literature, Calcutta, 1897.

[132]Burnouf could not complete his translation which was eventually done by Hauvette-Besnault and Roussel.

according to the traditional view. The list of the Mahā-Purāṇas is given in almost all Purāṇas, mostly in the same order, and it is uniform except for a couple of changes, but there is not uniformity in the enumeration of the Upa-Purāṇas. Authentic editions of the major Purāṇas were published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, the Anandasrama Sanskrit series of Poona, the Venkatesvara Press, Bombay, the Vangabasi Press, Calcutta (with texts and Bengali translation) and other institutions. Among the earlier English translations mention should be made of the *Bhāgavata*,,[133] *Agni*,[134] *Garuḍa*[135] and *Matsya*.[136] P.N. Sinha's *A Study of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa or Esoteric Hinduism* (Banaras, 1901) contained an English translation of the essential features of the *Bhāgavata*, omitting unimportant details, political description, prayers, adorations, etc. ·

According to Pargiter, who added to the Puranic studies a new dimension,[137] the Purāṇas, taken collectively "may be described as a popular encyclopaedia of ancient and medieval Hinduism, religious, philosophical, historical, personal, social and political".[138] Most Western scholars held that actually the Purāṇas belonged to the religious literature, and were for what was generally called Hinduism which expressed itself in the monotheistic cults of Viṣṇu or Śiva or other Supreme Beings of the sectarian creeds.[139] Blau[140] and Pargiter[141] held that the Purāṇas had a great antiquity having roots in the Vedas and tried to show that many a legend, already familiar from the Ṛgvedic hymns and from the Brāhmaṇa literature, reappeared in the Purāṇas. Jolly, Bühler and Pargiter had shown the intimate connection of the Purāṇas with the legal

[133]By M.N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1895; Swami Vijnanananda, in *SBH*, Allahabad 1922–23; S. Subba Rao, Tirupati, 1928; J.M. Sanyal, Calcutta, 1930–34.

[134]By M.N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1901.

[135]By M.N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1908.

[136]By a Taluqdar of Oudh in *SBH*, Allahabad, 1916–17.

[137]See his *The Puranic Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age*, Oxford, 1913.

[138]*ERE*, X, 448.

[139]Cf. Barth, *The Religions of India*, London, 1881, 153 ff.; Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, Boston, 1895, 434 ff.; Monier-Williams, *Brahmanism and Hinduism*, London, 1891; Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, II, London, 1921, Glasenapp, *Der Hinduismus*, Munich, 1922.

[140]A. Blau in *ZDMG*, LXII, 1908, 337ff.

[141]Pargiter in *JRAS*, 1910, 1328 ff.; 1911, 803ff.

texts[142] while their relations with the *Mahābhārata* were demonstrated by Holtzmann, Hopkins and Lüders.[143] A.M.T. Jackson[144] and A. Blau[145] tried to suggest that all the Purāṇas originated in a single original Purāṇa before their subsequent multiplication. The importance of the Purāṇas in the study of the royal dynasties of the ancient India was emphasised by V.A. Smith.[146] F.E. Pargiter made a thorough study of the Puranic lists of kings in his *The Puranic Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age* (London, 1913) and held that the Purāṇas were originally composed in Prākrit and subsequently rendered into Sanskrit—a view which was contested by A.B. Keith.[147] The chronology of the Purāṇas was studied by Bühler, Pargiter, Fleet and others and a comprehensive account of the Purāṇas and their position in Indian literature was presented by Winternitz.[148] Its religious contents were focussed also by J.N. Farquhar.[149] Haraprasad Sastri made a satisfactory grouping of the Purāṇas into six classes on the basis of their contents,[150] while V.R.R. Dikshitar, basing his division on the later Tamil works classified the Purāṇas into five groups, each being associated with the Brahmā, Sūrya, Agni, Śiva and Viṣṇu respectively.[151] K. Narayanaswami Aiyar's *The Purāṇas in the Light of Modern Science* (Madras, 1914) should also be mentioned in this connection.

Among specific works on the Purāṇas, E. Abegg in his *Der Pretakalpa des Garuḍa Purāṇa* (Leipzig, 1921) gave a detailed analysis of the contents of the *pretakalpa* or facts relating to the fate of the dead. Y.V. Kalhatkar in his Marathi *Śrīmadbhāgavatādarśa* (Poona, 1921) treated with various problems connected with the *Bhāgavata*

[142]Jolly, *Recht und Sitte* (Eng. trans. by B.K. Ghosh), Bühler in *Ind. Ant.*; XXV, 1896, 323 ff.; Pargiter, *Ancient Indian Historical Tradition*, Oxford, 1922, 43 ff.

[143]Holtzmann, *Das Mahābhārata*, IV, 29 ff.; Hopkins, *The Great Epic of India*, 47 ff.; Lüders in *Gesellschaft der Wisenschaften Gottingen*, 1897, 8 ff.

[144]*JBRAS*, XXI, 1905, 67 ff.

[145]*ZDMG*, LXII, 1908, 337 ff.

[146]*Early History of India*, 11 ff.; *ZDMG*, LVI, 1902, 654, 672 f.; cf. D.R. Bhandarkar in *JBARS*, XXII, 155 ff.

[147]*JRAS*, 1914, 1021 ff.; 1915, 328 ff. For details see Pusalker, 'Were the Purāṇas Originally in Prākrit?' in *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, 25–30.

[148]*HIL*, I, 517–86.

[149]*Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, London, 1920, 136 ff.

[150]*JBORS*, XIV, 323–40.

[151]*IHQ*, VIII, 766.

Purāṇa especially in the field of religion and philosophy. E.J. Rapson had a chapter on the Purāṇas in the *Cambridge History of India* (1922) where he regarded the Purāṇas as of Kṣatriya origin and the genealogies as partly legendary and partly historical. Har Dutt Sarma in his *Padma Purāṇa and Kālidāsa* (Calcutta, 1925) showed that the former was the source of Kālidāsa's *Śakuntalā* and *Raghuvaṃśa*. One of the most valuable contribution to the Purāṇa studies was W. Kirfel's *Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa* (Leiden, 1927) in which the author divided the texts of the Purāṇas into three groups and gave relevant extracts from each group under the five topics constituting the characteristic features of the Purāṇas, namely, *sarga* (creation), *pratisarga* (dissolution and recreation), *vaṃśa* (divine genealogies), *manvantara* (ages of Manus) and *vaṃśānucarita* (genealogies of the kings). Following Kirfel's method J.D.L. de Vries in his *Der Śrāddhakalpa im Harivaṃśa und im fümf anderen Puranen* (Bonn, 1928) had considered comparative texts for Śrāddhakalpa in the *Harivaṃsa* and five other Purāṇas— *Brahmāṇḍa, Śiva, Vāyu, Matsya* and *Padma*—to arrive at the original. In H. Meinhard's *Beitrāge Zur Kenntnis des Sivaismus nach den Purāṇen* (Berlin, 1928) Śaivism in the Purāṇas had been treated in detail. Meyer's *Gesetzbuch und Purāṇa* (Breslau, 1929) dealt with the interrelation of the Purāṇas and the lawbooks in which he asserted that the Purāṇas were the sources of Indian legal texts. It was actually a criticism of Losch's work on the *Yājñavalkya Smṛti* in which the reverse was stated.

The Indian flood legends in connection with the *Matsya Purāṇas* were studied by A. Hohenberger in his *Die Indische Flutsage und das Matsyapurāṇa* (Leipzig, 1930) in which the historical development of the Viṣṇu cult was also analysed. Durgashanker Shastri's Gujarati work *Purāṇa Vivecana* (Ahmedabad, 1931) dealt with various aspects of the Purāṇas, giving an analysis of each Purāṇa, and also with the chronology of the Purāṇas and their relation with Sanskrit literature. V.R.R. Dikshitar in his *Some Aspects of the Vāyu Purāṇa* (Madras, 1933) dealt with the cosmogony, historical aspects, religion, philosophy, music and other contents of the Purāṇa concerned. The same author's *Matsya Purāṇa: A Study* (Madras, 1935) dealt with the flood legends, polity, architecture and other aspects in addition to a study of the Tamil version of the said Purāṇa. E. Rose in his *Beitrage Zur Kenntnis des Śivaitschen Namenglaubens nach den Purāṇen* (Bonn, 1934) had given a number of texts on the

thousand names of Śiva found in the Purāṇas. T.R. Krishnacharya in the first part of his Index to the *Śrīmadbhāgavatam* (Kumbhakonam, 1934) dealt with the different legends of the *Bhāgavata* with reference to the *skandhas* and *adhyāyas* and in the second part provided an alphabetical index very useful for scholarly purpose. In his Bengali *Purāṇa Praveśas* (Calcutta, 1934), G.C. Bose had sought to introduce some order and consistency into the entire confused and tangled scheme of Puranic chronology.

R.C. Hazra in his *Studies in the Puranic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* (Dacca, 1940) had subjected the Purāṇas to a critical analysis from the ritualistic point of view. He established the chronology of the Puranic chapters dealing with Hindu rites and customs showing two stages—pre-Puranic and Puranic. According to him, in the former stage, which comprised the period from the third and fifth century AD only such topics on Hindu rites and customs were found which had parallels in the legal texts like those of Manu and Yājñavalkya, while in the latter stage, which dated from sixth century onwards, were incorporated new topics regarding gifts, initiation, sacrifices, *homa, pratiṣṭhā, tirthas, tithis, utsarga*, etc., not found in the earlier Smṛtis. D.R. Patil's *Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa* (Poona, 1946) was divided into two parts, the first giving the facts collected from the *Vāyu* and the second interpreting them in the light of other material and putting them in chronological sequence. The first five chapters in each part dealt with the intellectual culture and the last five with material culture. Patil's researches indicated three chronolgoical strata in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*. The appendix presented an alphabetical list of tribes and place names with cross references. Patil's work became the forerunner of many a cultural study of individual Purāṇas.

D.R. Mankad's *Puranic Chronology* (Bombay, 1951) was divided into two parts, the first consisting learned discussion on the *manvantara-caturyuga* method in its application both to pre-Kali and Kali chronology and the second on Kashmirian, Nepalese and Assamese chronology. Mankad's main thesis was that the Puranic genealogies were constructed on an arbitrary and artificial method. The *Purāṇa Index* (3 vols., Madras, 1951–55) by V.R.R. Dikshitar was an ambitious project dealing with names and descriptive accounts of deities, persons, tribes, mountains, rivers, etc. and some special entries containing summaries of myths and legends relating to deities, important characters and places. The work

could have been more useful if there was any critical edition of the Purāṇas capable of supplying uniform references, as had been possible in the case of the Vedic texts and also in that of the great epics. Yashpal Tandon's *Concordance of Purāṇa Contents* (Hoshiarpur, 1952) dealt, besides the introductory containing the characteristics, divisions, number, subjects, greatness, traditions, etc., with creation and dissolution, ages, genealogies, tribes and castes, spirituality, legal viewpoints, matters relating to the supramundane, deities and their manifestations, rituals, metaphysics and practical sciences. R.C. Hazra's *Studies in the Upapurāṇas* (Calcutta, 1958) dealt with all the principal aspects of the Upapurāṇas, traditionally 18 in number. This work had been of much use especially in the field of sectarian religious studies. Hazra places the Upapurāṇas between AD 650–800 and traced their origins to the activity of the Smārta adherents of the popular religious systems such as the Pāñcarātras, Pāśupatas, etc. who took up the Purāṇas for establishing the *varṇāśramadharma* and the authority of the Vedas among the masses, and increased the number of the already existing Purānas by the addition of fresh Puranic works—the Upapurāṇas. K.N. Datta's *The Bhāgavata: Its Philosophy, Its Ethics and Its Theology* (Madras, 1959) was a significant contribution conducive to the understanding of the essential features of the Vaiṣṇavite *bhakti* cult which later became a driving force of the medieval *bhakti* movements.

B.C. Mazumdar in his 'Origin and Character of the Purāṇa Literature'[152] held that the Purāṇa as a branch of sacred literature existed even in the Vedic days, that it was recognised as the fifth Veda when the *Atharvaveda* was recognised as the fourth part of the Veda, that for each Vedic school a separate Purāṇa was created (e.g. *Agni* for *RV*, *Vāyu* for *YV*, *Sūrya* for *SV*) and that the modern Purāṇas received only a little additional matter by way of accretions from the fifth century onwards, though the modern Purāṇas differed radically from the Vedic Purāṇas. The origin and history of the worship of phallus, Durgā and Śiva in the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas were also discussed. S.K. Chatterji pleaded for the recognition of the Jātaka as a repository of the Purāṇas containing old traditions and hence to be seriously taken along with the Brahmanic Purāṇas and epics. He also held that the Puranic stories had a pre-Aryan substratum in Prākrit originals, and dealt with the evolution of the Kṛṣṇa legend in Bengal.[153] In the 'Vedic Mantras and Legends in the Purāṇas'[154] P.V. Kane illustrated the view that though the rites, ceremonies usages and religious concepts on which most Purāṇas laid emphasis were different from the Vedic tradition, they did not ignore the latter. S.N. Dasgupta, in the third volume of his *History of Indian Philosophy* devoted a chapter to the 'Philosophical speculations of some of the selected Purāṇas' in which he dealt with the Puranic theories about Brahman, *kāla*, *ahaṃkāra*, yoga, *bhakti*, etc. A.D. Pusalker in the 'Puranic Cosmogony'[155] dealt with the evolution of Hindu cosmogonical ideas from the Vedic times down to the time of the Purāṇas. Jos. Abs drew attention to the heterodox systems of philosophy propounded by different Purāṇas.[156] S.L. Katre in his 'Avatāras of God' dealt with 33 incarnations of God giving a useful survey of the materials on *avatāras* scattered in different Purāṇas.[157]

There has been no dearth of monographs and articles on different aspects of the contents of the individual Purāṇas, especially on chronology, polity, royal dynastic lists, social and economic life, art and iconography, geography and topography, legal, scientific, medical, technological and other aspects. So far as the religious and philosophical aspects were concerned, some of such monographs contained a lot of informations. The tradition of the cultural studies of the Purāṇas, set up by D.R. Patil and others as early as in the forties, was continued in the subsequent decades. A.B.L. Awasthi's *Studies in the Skanda Purāṇa* bore this tradition. V.S. Agrawala's *Matsya Purāṇa : A Study* (Varanasi, 1963) and *Vāmana Purāṇa: A Study* (Varanasi, 1964) contained useful arrangements of the materials under diverse headings. His *Devīmāhātmya* (Varanasi, 1963) was also based mainly on Puranic materials. S.P. Pathak's Hindi-work *Viṣṇupurāṇa kā Bhārata* (Varanasi, 1967) contained various informations on the religious systems and focussed much light on the various developments of Vaiṣṇavism leading to its institutionalisation. We have already had the occasion to refer to

[152] *Sir Asutosh Mukherjee Silver Jubilee Com. Vol.*, Calcutta, 7–30.

[153] *Woolner Comm. Vol.*, 34–40; *BSOAS*, VIII, 457–66.

[154] *Raja Comm. Vol.*, 5 ff.

[155] *Bhāratiya Vidyā*, II, 177–91; rep. in *Studies in the Epics and Purāṇas*, 1–24.

[156] *Festgabe Jacobi*, 386–96.

[157] *Journal of Oriental Research*, V, 55–67, 80–100.

the earlier attempts to arrange systematically the contents of the Purāṇas under different topics and sub-topics. N.Y. Desai's *Ancient Indian Society, Religion and Mythology as Depicted in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa*, (Baroda, 1968) should also be mentioned in this connection. Among the subsequent attemps in this direction mention should be made of Padmini Menon's *Purāṇa Sandarbha Kośa* (Kanpur, 1969). Vettam Mani's *Puranic Encyclopaedia*, which was a comprehensive dictionary with special reference to the epics and the Puranic literature, came out from Delhi in 1978.

Among works dealing with the religious contents of the individual Purāṇas R.K. Aurora's *Historical and Cultural Data from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* (Delhi, 1972) contained chapters on the Magas and the Sun worship, Cults of Brahmā and Gaṇeśa, the concepts of heaven and hell, rules on fasts, gifts and other religious sacraments, temple architecture and iconography. P.G. Lalye's *Studies in the Devībhāgavata* (Bombay, 1973) was a comprehensive study of the religion and philosophy of Śāktism besides that of other contents of the text. Among other recent religious studies associated with the Purāṇas K. Bharadvaja's *A Philosophical Study of the Concept of Viṣṇu in the Purāṇas* should be specially mentioned. Savitri K. Kumar's *The Puranic Lore of Holy Water-Places with Special Reference to Skanda Purāṇa* (New Delhi, 1983) was also a significant contribution to the religious studies especially in connection with the *tīrthas*. So was C.M. Brown's *God as Mother: An Historical and Theological Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* (Hartfort, 1974). In the field of myths and legends associated with various religious beliefs and practices Benjamin P. Solis's *The Kṛṣṇa Cycle in the Purāṇas: Themes and Motives in a Heroic Saga* (Delhi, 1984) dealt with the evolution of Kṛṣṇa legends from the earliest period and then subsequent metamorphosis in the Purāṇas. Sindhu S. Dange's *The Bhāgavata Purāṇa—Mytho-Social Study* (Delhi, 1984) was an interpretative study on a few selected topics like 'Śeṣa: The great serpent', 'The navel lotus', 'curse: an effective strategy', 'customs and beliefs', 'exploits of Kṛṣṇa as a cowherd boy', 'incarnation' and 'folk beliefs in philosophical allegory'. T.B. Coburn's *Devīmāhātmya* (Delhi, 1984) argued that the caṇḍi section of the *Mārkaṇḍeya* was the first attempt of the Sanskritization of the non-Aryan Mother goddess cult.

From a religious point of view Puranic studies did not gain as much importance as was due to them. The Purāṇas were variously utilised by the scholars, but unlike Vedism or Buddhism, their

religious contents were not sufficiently studied in themselves, although while dealing with various religious systems, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, Puranic materials were used. Various editions of the Purāṇas were published by different institutions, in most cases, the texts along with translations in regional languages, as we have noted above. Pioneer in this field was the Vangavasi Press of Calcutta. There was no dearth of English translation as well. A recent attempt to bring out the Purāṇas with English translation; critical introduction, footnotes and general index under the title Ancient Indian Tradition and Mythology by such eminent Puranic experts as J.L. Shastri, G.V. Tagore, N. Gangadharan, S. Venkatasubramania Iyer, N.A. Deshpande and others is expected to be very helpful in further Puranic studies.

CHAPTER 6

Works Bearing on Religious History — Diverse Approaches

The earliest among the numerous handbooks written by the European authors introducing the Indian religious systems and dealing with their genesis and development from historical and doctrinal point of view was probably J.Z. Holwell's *A Review of the Original Principles, Religious and Moral, of the Ancient Brahmins* which was published from London in 1779. It was an account of the mythology, cosmology, rituals and festivals of the Hindus. It is interesting to note that Holwell refused to call Hinduism a polytheistic religion. He described Hinduism as one of the three religions which believed in one supreme being.[1] The next important work was Edward Moor's *The Hindu Pantheon* which was first published in 1810.[2] Moor had no special acquaintance with the literary sources pertaining to the religious systems of India, but he was a keen observer having an inquisitive and acquisitive mind which led him to devise a methodology of his own. He conversed with different sections of the people and gathered from them informations regarding the religious and ritualistic life of the Hindus, their mythology, especially the Puranic lores relating to the deities with which the average Indian was traditionally acquainted. Another interesting aspect of Moor's methodology was that he laid great emphasis on the utility of pictures and visible objects and as such he became the pioneer of iconographic studies. With the help of

[1]Even before Holwell, Luke Scrafton in his *Reflections on the Government of Indostan*, London, 1763 insisted on the monotheistic character of Hinduism. Alexander Dow in his *History of Hindostan*, London, 1768, said that the "Brahmins, contrary to the ideas formed of them in the West, invariably believe in the unity, eternity, omniscience and omnipotence of that" and that the so called Hindu polytheism was "no more than a symbolic worship of the divine attributes". Charles Wilkins in his introduction to the translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*, London, 1785, held the same view.

[2]A revised edition of this volume was brought out by Rev. W.O. Simpson in 1864 in which more than a hundred pages of the original were cut off and new materials added.

his artist friend Mr. Haughton of the Royal Academy he got the images of the deities, temples and Stūpas, scenes of the rituals and other cult objects accurately portrayed; in fact, his book was gathered round the pictures. The deities described were mostly Vaiṣṇavite, Śaivite and Śāktaite, though some Vedic gods, zoomorphic and regional deities, some glimpses of Buddhism and Jainism also found their way. Moor's style was far from being easy and attractive, but his study of Hinduism and its polytheistic overgrowths was guided by a spirit of honest enquiry and understanding. Moor developed an interest in comparative mythology owing to his acquaintance with the works of William Jones, Colebrooke, Wilford and Wilkins and he held that the Hindu legends of gods and goddesses were the source of Greek and Roman mythologies.

H.T. Colebrooke did not write any comprehensive volume, but his articles on Indian religion and philosophy published in reputed academic journals between 1805 and 1828[3] revealed his own viewpoint which, despite its Christian bias, tried to establish the theory that "the Hindu theology will be found consistent with monotheism though it contains the seeds of polytheism and idolatry". His illustrious predecessor Sir William Jones was more interested in comparative mythology than details of religious belief and practices. He held that Hindus considered God "in three characters of Creator, Regenerator and Preserver".[4] H.H. Wilson's *Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus* which was originally serialised in the *Asiatic Researches* in 1814–15 and printed in book form in 1846[5] mostly contained descriptive account of the religious sects which flourished in the medieval period of Indian history. It also dealt with the earlier sectarian divisions on the basis of Ānandagiri's *Śaṅkaradigvijaya* and Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*.[5] Rev. W. Ward's *A View of History, Literature and Religion of the Hindoos* (3 vols.,

[3]Subsequently incorporated in his *Miscellaneous Essays* (3 vols.), London, published by his son Edward Colebrooke. Recently these were reprinted under various titles like *Essays on the Religion and Philosophy of the Hindus, Essays on the History, Literature and Religion of Ancient India* and so on.

[4]See his *Works*, ed. by Teignmouth, London, 1807, IV, 221.

[5]Subsequently reprinted under various titles by enthusiastic publishers. However, it was Wilson's another work *Lectures on the Religion and Philosophy of the Hindus* which came out in 1840 (edited by R. Rost and incorporated in Wilson's *Collected Works*, London, 1861) that came to be regarded as the precursor of later historical studies on Indian religious systems.

Serampore, 1818) dealt with a variety of subjects which included the surviving cults of Puranic deities, various conceptions of gods and goddesses, the Puranic legends like those pertaining to the goddess Durgā, etc., animal, tree and stone worship, popular deities like Śītalā or Manasā and even saints like Śrī Caitanya along with a minute description of Hindu manners and customs and translation from their principal works. Notwithstanding his strong Christian bias, he held that Hinduism certainly believed in the oneness of God although the Hindu concept of this oneness is somewhat different from the Christian and that "speaking of God and His abstract state, some of the Hindu sages could express sublime conceptions, though mixed with error". Though he had little or no respect towards that brand of idolatrous Hinduism which was practised in his days he wrote that "it is true indeed that the Hindoos believed in the unity of God" and that "one Brumuh (*brahman*), without a second, is a phrase very commonly used by them when conversing on subjects which relate to the nature of God".

While Sir William Jones's insistence on comparative mythology created a craze among European scholars who made almost a monopoly of Vedic studies, his successors in India tried to penetrate the epico-Puranic legends associated with various deities, as a result of which some notable works on this subject came into light. Among the authors of these works, W.J. Wilkins confined his work to the Vedic and Puranic deities with special relation to the mythology pertaining to the Bengal region.[6] But his approach was purely historical and interpretative. For example, he said that "Indra gradually superseded Dyaus in the worship of the Hindus, soon after their settlement in India: As the song of the newer god was sung, the older one was forgotten, and at the present day, whilst Dyaus is almost unknown, Indra is still regarded". Regarding Agni he wrote: "In the old Vedic hymns there is an interesting reference to Agni. He is spoken of as dwelling between two pieces of wood. It is noticed as a remarkable fact that a living being should spring out of dry, dead wood. Stranger even than this, the child Agni, as soon as he is born, begins to consume the wood, his parents, that gave him birth. Wonderful indeed is his growth, seeing he is born, says the Vedic poet, 'of a mother who cannot nourish him, but whom, as, he grows, he destroys'!" Colonel Kennedy, however, depended

[6]W.J. Wilkins, *Hindu Mythology*, London, 1870.

solely on the Puranic sources.[7] Regarding the Hindu mythological figures he observed: "Some of these are of an entirely cosmic character; others, however, are probably based on historical events, the leading of which was gradually endowed with divine attributes, till he was regarded as an incarnation of the deity himself". Dowson[8] held that it was the Purāṇas and the two great epics that should be regarded as the principal sources of our knowledge of Indian gods. It must be confessed that to the majority of the Hindus "the Veda is a mere name—a name of high authority, often invoked and generally reverenced—but its language is unintelligible and its gods and rites things of past. The Purāṇas and later writings are the great authorities of modern Hinduism; their mythology and legends fill the popular mind and mould its thoughts. The wonderful tales of the great poems, also exercise a supreme influence. The heroes of these poems are heroes still; their exploits with many exaggerations and embellishments are recounted in prose and verse by hundreds of wandering persons and recited in every temple".[9]

Although the early European writers did not fully subscribe to Macaulay's theory that "the Brahmanical mythology is so absurd that it necessarily debases every mind that receives it as truth", they considered the Christian monotheism as the natural culmination in the evolutionary process in the development of religious beliefs and practices, and those aspects of Hinduism were specially favoured by them which they found more akin to the Christian concepts. They

[7]J. Kennedy, *Hindu Mythology*, London, 1831, second ed., 1882.

[8]J. Dowson, *Dictionary of Hindu Mythology*, London, 1888.

[9]Among many other works on Indian mythology mention should be specially made of V. Fausböll's *Indian Mythology*, Copenhagen, 1902 which was based on the *Mahābhārata* was dealt with the Asuras, Daityas, Dānavas, Dasyus, Nāgas, Rākṣasas, Piśācas, the warfare of the Suras and Asuras, Ādityas, Brahman (both neuter and masculine), Sūrya, Indra, Varuṇa, Viṣṇu, Apsarās, Aśvins, Maruts, Pitṛs, Prajāpati, Rbhus, Rudras, Sādhya, Siddhas, Vālakhilyas, Vasus, Agni, Vāyu, Vidyādharas and Yakṣas. E.W. Hopkins's *Epic Mythology*, Strassburg, 1915, was more a critical study of the two epics than a pure study of mythology which dealt every thing contained in them and his analysis of the facts contributed immensely to the study of the historical genesis and development of sectarian religious systems. Sister Nivedita and Ananda Coomaraswamy in their *Myths of the Hindu and Buddhists*, London, 1914, made a venture to present some aspects of Indian mythology with a view to pinpointing the typical Indian attitude towards life and universe. It dealt with the mythology of the Indo-Aryan races, stories from the Vedas, epics and Purāṇas with special chapters on the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata* and also on Kṛṣṇa, Buddha and Śiva.

considered Hinduism to be an antiquated system. Even a scholar like Max Müller believed that the educated Hindus after reading the Vedas in original or in translation would understand how false their religion was and embrace Christianity. Monier-Williams said of Brahmanism: "Its policy being to check the development of intellect and to keep the inferior castes in perpetual childhood, it encouraged an appetite for exaggeration more monstrous and more absurd than would be tolerated in the most extravagant European fairy tales". Max Müller observed: "Brahmanism as a religion cannot stand the light of day. The worship of Śiva, of Viṣṇu, and of other popular deities is of the same, nay, in many cases of a more degraded and savage character than the worship of Jupiter, Apollo and Minarva; it belongs to a stratum of thought which is long buried beneath our feet; it may live on, like a lion or a tiger, but the mere air of free thought and civilised life will extinguish it. It is true that there are millions of men, women and children in India who fall down before the stone images of Viṣṇu with his four arms, riding on a creature half-bird, half-man or sleeping on a serpent; who worship Śiva, a monster with three eyes, riding naked on a bull, with a necklace of skulls for his ornament. There are human beings who still believe in a god of war, Kārttikeya, with six faces, riding on a peacock, and holding bow and arrow in his hands; and who invoke a god of success, Gaṇeśa, with four hands and an elephant's head, sitting on a rat. Nay, it is time that in the broad daylight of the nineteenth century, the figure of the goddess Kālī is carried through the street of her own city, Calcutta, her wild dishevelled hair reaching to her feet, with a necklace of human heads, her tongue protruded from her mouth, her girdle stained with blood. All this is true; but ask any Hindu who can read, write and think, whether these are the gods he believes in, and he will smile at your credulity. How long this living death of natural religion in India may last no one can tell".[10]

Thus there was obviously an ambivalence in the Western approach to the study of the Indian religious systems. While they showered unrestricted praise on the basic Hindu concepts and their highest metaphysical and theological expressions, they found certain features which they were unable to reconcile with the experience of their textual studies and with the standards which they

[10]Lecture on missions delivered in the nave of Westminster Abbey on December 3, 1873.

inherited on the one hand from the Christian tradition and on the other the eighteenth-nineteenth century rationalism of Europe. The nature of this ambivalence has been clearly explained in the works of Sir Monier-Williams.[11] In his own words: "I am deeply convinced that the more we learn about the ideas, feelings, drift of thought, religious development, eccentricities and even errors and superstitions of the natives of India, the less ready shall we be to judge by our own conventional European standards; the less disposed to regard ourselves as the sole depositaries of all true knowledge, learning, virtue and refinement existing on the earth; the less prove to despise as an inferior race, the men who compiled the Laws of Manu, one of the most remarkable literary productions of the world; who thought out systems of ethics worthy of Christianity; who composed the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*, poems in some respects out-rivalling the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*; who invented for themselves the science of grammar, arithmatic, astronomy, logic and who elaborated independently six most subtle systems of philosophy. Above all, the less inclined to stigmatise as 'benighted heathens' the authors of two religions, which, however lamentably antagonistic to Christianity, are at this moment professed by about half the human race". But side by side he expressed his unhappiness with the functional Hinduism which he described as follows: "There is not an object in heaven and earth which a Hindu is not prepared to worship—sun, moon and stars; rocks, stocks and stones; trees, shrubs and grass; sea, pools and rivers; his own implements of trade, the animals he finds most useful, the noxious reptiles he fears, men remarkable for extraordinary qualities—for great valour, sanctity, virtue and even vice; good and evil demons, ghosts and goblins, the spirits of departed ancestors; an infinite number of semi-human and semi-divine existences, inhabitants of seven upper and seven lower worlds—each and all come in for a share of divine honours on a tribute of more or less adoration". Thus on the one hand his admiration of the scripture of Hinduism and on the other disdain for its functional aspects led him to explain the phenomenon in terms of modern rationalisations which brought the Hindu tenets in close proximity with the Christian monotheistic ideas. "All orthodox Hindus believe in one universal spirit who becomes Supreme Lord over all. At the same time they believe that this one God has

[11]*Indian Wisdom*, London, 1875; *Hinduism*, London, 1877; *Religious Thought and Life in India*, London, 1883, etc.

taken various forms, all of which may be worshipped; just as gold is one everywhere though it may take different forms and names in different places and countries. Every man chooses his favourite god, or divine object, to which he pays special homage."

This was also the view of the eminent Hindu leaders of India of the nineteenth century like Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, Balgangadhar Tilak, Dayananda Saraswati and others, the formulation of which was to a certain extent oversimplified. According to them monotheism was the highest religious ideal and they wanted to explain all the aspects of Hinduism in terms of this ideal. They did not take note of the fact that, unlike Christianity, Islam or Judaism, Hinduism was always a changing system—the nineteenth-century Hinduism was different from the eighteenth, the eighteenth from the seventeenth, and so on. Secondly, the socio-economic and cultural background of Hindu polytheism and the variety of its rituals were not taken into account. While dealing with the Hindu religion they overlooked the basic fact that the Indian society was a plural society the ideal of which was achieved by the two well calculated means of the caste system which, despite its insistence on the inequality of status and position of different castes in the social body, offered economic security and cultural freedom to the masses. The Indian society was constituted by a synthesis of many races. This also happened elsewhere, and owing to the influence of the conquering race the conquered ones lost their political, economic and cultural independence. But this did not happen in India where all the constituent races and tribes could retain their identity. According to the ancient Hindu sociologists, where groups of people belonging to diverse races, languages and cultures met and mingled it was possible to synthesize them in a greater society through the caste system in which, apart from the economic security and social autonomy, absolute cultural freedom was assured. Each group was allowed to follow their traditional social practices, cults and rituals, laws and customs.

A. Barth's *The Religions of India*[12] was meant for that class of readers who took interest in questions of historical theology, but who happened to have no special acquaintance with Indian studies. The first part of this work comprised a general view of the Vedic literature, its age and successive formations, priority of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*, principal divinities of the hymns, the world and its objects, abstract

[12]Translated into English by Rev. J. Wood, London, 1881.

personification and mythical figures, ways in which the myths were treated in the hymns, monotheistic conceptions, pantheistic cosmogony, piety and morality, coexistence of baser forms of beliefs and practices, speculations regarding sacrifice and prayer, *ṛta* and Brahman, the changes introduced in the pantheon as well as in the spirit and institutions in the later Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, and in the increasing influence of ritualism with special emphasis on the Gṛhya and Śrauta rituals. According to Barth, the Vedas in general, and the *Ṛgveda* in particular, had nothing of that primitive simplicity which most scholars were eager to find in them. On the contrary they were of a singularly refined character of pretensions to mysticism and theosophic insight. He laid emphasis on the part played by the Brāhmaṇas in the elaboration of the philosophic doctrines and the Upaniṣads were viewed by him as containing in a confused form the germs of the conceptions afterwards systematised in the philosophical systems, especially in the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta, the doctrines of *karma*, rebirth, yoga and salvation, the atheistic, materialistic, dualistic and monistic doctrines. According to him, the formation of an orthodox Brahmanical literature, popularly accessible such as the Purāṇas and the law-books paved the way for the growth of monotheistic cults and the gradual decay of the ceremonial observances of the ancient rituals. He considered Buddhism and Jainism—the history and doctrines of which were elaborately treated in his work—to be the most direct and deliberate repudiation of Brahmanism, and the causes of the downfall of Buddhism was attributed by him to its internal vices which had disabled it from competing with the sectarian religions. So far as the sectarian religions were concerned—to which were devoted four chapters—he held that these systems had a very ancient origin, though their history was comparatively modern and that the Brāhmaṇas controlled these new systems though these had never been entirely subjected to them. According to him the common characteristics of the sectarian religions was the supremacy they assigned to the new divinities of popular origin, identified with Rudra Śiva and Viṣṇu. Though formed of the same materials as those of the ancient religions, the new divinities were of a more obstinate personality with a marked tendency to monotheism.

While Barth aimed at making his reader know all about the religions, Hopkins in his book under the same title[13] sought to make

[13]*The Religions of India*, London, 1885.

his readers know those religions, to show the lines on which developed the various theological and moral concepts of the Hindus, not only by furnishing, from the point of view of a foreign critic, an annotated narrative of the growth of these concepts but also by taking the reader step by step through the literature that contained the records of India's religious systems. Hopkins insisted on comparative approach and on reconciling the opposed and conflicting opinions which came in forms of theorisations, especially in the case of the Vedic religion. He had taken into account the land and the people stating that by the religion of the Aryan Hindus he meant the religion of a people who, undoubtedly, were full-blooded Aryans at first, however much their blood might have been diluted later by non-Aryan admixture. In dealing with the religion of the *Ṛgveda* he had divided the Ṛgvedic deities in three categories—upper, middle and lower—in conformity with Yāska's classification into celestial, atmospheric and terrestrial gods—and described their physical background and characteristics by citing copious verses associated with them. He had also made a fourth category containing Yama and some other abstract deities and dealt with at length with the nature of Vedic pantheon and eschatology. Only a few pages were devoted to the study of the religion of the *Atharvaveda* in which respect he was rather reluctant to share the view that it revealed a lower form of worship. The post-Ṛgvedic religion was described by him as Brahmanism which was characterised by Brahmanic theology and sacrifice, but he found that its terrible and barbaric side was getting replaced by a more human religion which insisted on human duties, ethical aspects, doctrines of *karma*, transmigration and metempsychosis. According to Hopkins the Brahmanic pantheism culminated in the Upaniṣadic concept of Brahman. He held that a popular form of Brahmanic faith containing the elements of various Vedic beliefs and practices, including the philosophical doctrines of the Upaniṣads and the monotheistic trends later acquired distinctiveness which was found in the epico-puranic and legal literature tailored according to the varying extent of public adaptability. The origins of Buddhism and Jainism were traced to the reaction against the so called Brahmanical ritualism. The life of Mahāvīra and the Jain dogmas were discussed, though Hopkins failed to appreciate the contribution of Jainism, to the sphere of human thought. He was, however, more liberal about Buddhism and described the system in its totality. About its so called decline he agreed with Barth

in assigning the first place to the torpidity of later church in matters of religion. "It has become a great machine; its spiritual enthusiasm had been exhausted; it had nothing poetical or beautiful save the legend of the Buddha, and this had lost its freshness; for Buddha was now, in fact, only a grinning idol." He dealt extensively with Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism which he considered to be the essentials of Hinduism and the other monotheistic cults in the same line which also became integral parts of Hinduism and developed, according to him, in imitation of the former two systems. He held that the Purāṇas had created a religious syncretism.

Alfred Lyall made a remarkable attempt to understand Hinduism in its totality.[14] Lyall, who had wide experience in Indian life and was a trusted government official, summed up his point of view in a striking illustration: "The whole panorama of religious ideas and practices in polytheistic India may be compared with each other; some falling into decay, others shooting up vigorously and overtopping the crowd—while the glimpse of blue sky above the tree tops may symbolise the illimitable transcendental ideas have and apart from the earth born conceptions". We quote his observations on two principal Hindu deities—Śiva and Viṣṇu. "The august and terrible Śiva represents in all probability the earliest and most general impression of endless and pitiless change, the recurrent ebb and flow of life. Incarnated, he becomes the dread agent of destruction, and at the same time the lord and giver of life. For though by inexorable law all things are liable to decay and disintegration, yet Nature is endlessly reproducing herself in various forms of life. The whole circle of animated creation is therefore his. He presides over incessant round of birth and death in which Nature eternally revolves. The moral significance and mighty sway of this deity, lord of time, ruler of life and death, can only be even dimly estimated by those who have seen the thousand of temples scattered up and down the length and breadth of India. He is more worshipped as he is more dreaded than any single incarnation in India. Viṣṇu, on the other hand, impersonates the higher evolution; the upward tendency of human spirit. He represents several great and far-reaching religious ideas. In the increasing flux and change of all things he is their preserver; and although he is one of the highest gods he has constantly revisited the earth either in animal or human shape. Most of the famous saints, heroes,

[14] *Asiatic Studies*, 2 vols., London, 1897.

demi-gods of poetry and romance, with many of the superior divinities, are recognised as having been the sensible manifestations of Viṣṇu; their bodies were only the mortal vesture that he assumed for the purpose of interposing decisively at some great emergency, or whenever he condescended to become again an actor in the world's drama. The theory of divine embodiment is one of the most essential and effective doctrines of Hinduism; it links together and explains the various phases of the religion, connecting the lower with the higher ideas and providing them with a common ground of method of reconciliation. It serves to show, for instance, that the sacred animal of a wild tribe is merely the Brahmanic deity in disguise, or it may prove that the worshippers of some obscure or local hero have been adoring Viṣṇu unawares. It thus accommodates and absorbs the lower deities; and while it draws them up to the sky and completes their apotheosis, it also brings the higher gods constantly down again from heaven to take part in human affairs".[15]

R.B. Lala Baijnath[16] tried to show that despite various metamorphoses at different period of history Hinduism represented a continuity and that despite subsequent sophistications, both in positive and negative aspects, the basic tenets of Hinduism which were formulated as early as the Vedic period remained unaltered. He was critical about European scholarship which, according to him, insisted more on isolated study in which various streams were artificially separated from their original context and treated individually and not as the part of an integrated whole. A comparative study was found in J. Robson's *Hinduism and Christianity* (London, 1905) which was inspired by the earlier studies of Weber and Grierson and aimed at emphasising the monotheistic aspects of Hinduism. The author, notwithstanding his pronounced Christian bias, tried to make a balanced estimate of the probabilities of Christianity in a Hindu India. J. Murray Mitchell[17] considered the Hindus as the descendants of the ancient Aryans. According to him the Aryans were nature-worshippers who believed that their material welfare depended on the action of the powers of nature, the sky, the air, the sun and other natural forces. In the absence of direct revelation they turned to these with gratitude and love mingled with awe

[15]Ibid., II, 306–07.

[16]*Hinduism: Ancient and Modern*, London, 1905.

[17]*The Great Religions of India*, London, 1906.

and reverence. As the Aryans advanced into the territories of the aborigines inhabiting the vast plain of northern India, they adopted not a few of their beliefs and rites, and the corruption of their religion must have proceeded with great rapidity. A richly peopled mythology arose eventually in India as in Greece. There had been a large growth from within and large accretions from without. Subsequently with the advent of Buddhism a great reconstruction took place in Hinduism. New gods came in. New doctrines like those of transmigration and *bhakti* were introduced. Symbolism and idolatry became prominent features. The Hindu way of life was characterised by caste system, animal sacrifice and burning of the widows. Almost a similar line of approach was formulated by J.N. Farquhar.[18] Unlike Mitchell, Farquhar was thoroughly acquainted with Hindu scriptures and wrote a useful volume on the religious literature of India. But to him Hinduism ceased to be a living force and India's conversion to Christianity was only a question of time. He classified the history of the Hindu religion into prehistoric (represented by Indo-Aryan languages), creative (represented by the Vedas), sacerdotal (represented by the later Vedas and Brāhmaṇas), philosophic (represented by the Upaniṣads, Buddhism and Jainism), scholastic (represented by the schools of philosophy), incarnatory (represented by theistic trends), decadent (represented by the Purāṇas), reconstructive (represented by five major cults) and devotional (represented by the *bhakti* movement). The work also contained chapters on Hindu family and asceticism, besides tables of illustrative readings. The concluding part dealt with 'Hinduism as a System' in four sections under the titles 'What it is to be a Hindu today', 'the religion of the lower classes', 'formative elements of Hinduism', and 'future of Hinduism'. In his subsequent *Crown of Hinduism* (1913), he made a comparative study of Hinduism and Christianity in which the points of similarities between the two systems were emphasised and those points were declared to be the essence of Hinduism.

Rev. E. Osborn Martin, a Wesleyan missionary in India and Ceylon, published in 1913 a book on Hindu deities which was based solely on secondary sources.[19] Its purpose was to furnish an account of the deities known to India as a whole. After two introductory chapters dealing with the development of Hindu mythol-

[18]*A Primer of Hinduism*, London, 1911.

[19]E.O. Martin, *The Gods of India*, London, 1913.

ogy and the relative value of the sources of information, the author had ventured to classify and group the deities of Hinduism under three separate heads (the Vedic deities, the Puranic deities and the inferior deities) giving a brief introductory chapter to the third section and concluding with a chapter summing up the whole subject and defining the scope and value of Hindu mythology. The author raised some important questions: "What part does it (Hindu mythology) play in the upbuilding of the great Hindu community, what consolation, what hope, what inspiration in living has it given to the dim wandering millions who have turned to it in their times of crisis and need? Can Hindu mythology be said to have a moral value? Does it not obscure the moral sense?" He frankly admitted that these questions could not be answered, because it was extremely difficult for the most sympathetic and learned European scholar to understand the mental position (*penetralia*) of the devout Hindu, who implicitly believes the wildest and most contradictory myths, and worships with utter abandon at the shrines of some strange conception of deity. But side by side he held that "if, however, the student of Hindu Mythology will leave such considerations outside his purview, and approach its study with unbiased mind, it will prove to be one of undoubted fascination. There are the whole realms of Hindu mythological thought still to be surveyed. The study of origins; the influence on Hindu mythological conceptions of aboriginal deities on the one hand, and the gods of nations outside India on the other hand; and the close relationship of Hindu mythology with the ancient Persian, Greek and Roman deities, are themes replete with interest and should present a strong call of men of scholarship and leisure. Such study would open out questions, and possibly solve problems, of the deepest importance to students of ethnology and comparative religion".

Nicol Macnicol's *Indian Theism* (London, 1915) wanted to establish that theism and pantheism coexisted at all periods of Indian religious development and attempted to present a historical account of the theistic efforts from the Vedic to the Muhammedan period. The historical narrative was followed by some account of the theology which, whether articulated into a system or only partially conscious of itself, lay behind the cultures and the experience. The record of the theistic facts was supplemented by a survey of the theistic life and faith by the presentation of the thought

which was implicit in it and which endeavoured to explain it. Finally an attempt was made to frame an appreciation of the value of this religious movement and its results by means of a comparison of it with the normative ethical theism of Christianity. According to the author, in India it is difficult to demarcate the boundaries of theism and pantheism, to say that here one ends and the other begins. "But at the same time we may have implicit theisms, efforts of the spirit in its direction, which have not reached and may never reach full self consciousness and yet to which, the name need not be refused. We cannot decide by any *a priori* rule what should be admitted to our survey and what excluded from it. It will be possible for us, however, after the whole field, with whatever it has to present to us—whether we have to pronounce it good or bad, the product of the crude emotions of the half-civilized or of a super refined intellectual subtlety—has been surveyed, to judge the value of India's efforts after a theistic faith in the light of such a fully ethical theism of the Christian religion. Christianity provides the standard against which the products of Indian reflection and devotion can most suitably be measured".

Sir Charles Eliot's *Hinduism and Buddhism: An Historical Sketch* was published in three volumes from London in 1921. The volumes were divided into seven books, the first containing an introduction in which the importance of the study of the Indian religious systems was stressed with special references to certain basic concepts which characterised the Indian religious systems through the ages. Book II dealt with the earlier religious forms with special emphasis on the general characteristics of Indian religion, the Vedic deities and sacrifices, asceticism and knowledge, religious life in pre-Buddhist India and facts about Jainism. Book III dealt with Pali Buddhism in which connection the life and teaching of the Buddha, the canon, monks and lay men, the role of Emperor Aśoka in the propagation of Buddhism, Buddhist meditation and mythology were discussed. Essentials of the Mahāyāna were discussed in the fourth book while the fifth dealt with Hinduism with special reference to Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Śāktism, Hindu philosophy, amalgamation of Hinduism and Islam and the rise of Sikhism. The sixth book dealt with Buddhism outside India and the seventh with mutual influence of Eastern and Western religions. The work is basically descriptive and informative

and is very useful and well documented. According to Sir Charles, "here more than in any country the national mind finds its favourite occupation and full expression in religion. This quality is geographical rather than racial, for it is possessed by the Dravidians as much as by Aryans. From the Rājā to the peasant most Hindus have an interest in theology and often a passion for it. Few works of art or literature are purely secular: the intellectual and aesthetic efforts of India, long, continuous and distinguished as they are, are monotonous inasmuch as they are almost all the expression of some religious phase. But the religion itself is extraordinary full and varied. The love of discussion and speculation creates considerable variety in practice and unlimited variety in creed and theory".

J. Estlin Carpenter's *Theism in Medieval India* (Oxford, 1921) was the expanded version of his Hibbert Lectures which attempted to present a general view of the phases of theism that covered the period from the middle of the seventh century AD to the end of sixteenth century. The first seven lectures dealt respectively with the origins of theistic Buddhism, popular theism, religious philosophy in the great epic, the *trimūrti*, philosophy and religion in Śaivism and religion and philosophy in Vaiṣṇavism. The eighth lecture dealt with the relation between Hinduism and Islam. A note on Christianity in India was presented as an appendix. Carpenter used the term theism in its widest aspect. According to him even the philosophic pantheism of the Vedānta admitted a relative reality to the theistic interpretation of the world and man. Carpenter observed: "In the admitted uncertainties of Indian chronology it seemed desirable to secure a firm point of departure. This is provided by the journey of the Chinese Buddhist Yuan Chwang to Nalanda in the seventh century A.D. Buddhism had then developed its significant theistic types and its chief philosophical schools. The interaction and mutual influence of Buddhism and Hinduism present many problems of great interest, but also of great difficulty. It is no part of the purpose of this book to enter into their technical discussion. But as other histories of the religions of India have not always realised the importance of the part played by Buddhism, it seemed well to start with the presentation of its teachings as they were open to Yuan Chwang's study. The close of the reign of Akbar, the contemporary of Queen Elizabeth, sees the failure of his attempt to establish an imperial monotheism which should

transcend both Islam and the ancient native faiths, while it finds Hinduism provided with the greatest religious poem, the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Tulsīdās, and the community of the Sikhs passing into a small but vigorous church-nation with this era the volume ends".

L.D. Barnett's *Hindu Gods and Heroes* (1923) comprised his Forlong Bequest lectures delivered in the School of Oriental Studies. It was a descriptive account of the Indian religious systems. The first lecture dealt with the religion of the Vedic age in which the nature and characteristics of the Vedic deities, the Vedic concept of rituals, and the transition from the age of the Saṃhitās to that of the Brāhmaṇas and from the latter to that of the Upaniṣads in the field of religious ideas and concepts was demonstrated in historical outline. The second lecture dealt with the period of the epics and thereafter showing how the epic heroes were transformed into deities and in this connection threw light on the origin of the sectarian religions. The third dealt with the generation of philosophers, starting from Ācārya Śaṅkara and the theistic interpreters of the Vedānta school, the doctrines preached and the institutions set up by them along with the medieval exponents of the *bhakti* movement with special emphasis on the saints of Maharashtra. Sten Konow's *Die Inder* (1925)[20] was a very useful summarisation of the principal religious doctrines of India along with their literature, an elaboration of which we come across in his subsequent bigger work on Indian religions done in collaboration with Paul Tuxen. D.S. Sharma's *A Primer of Hinduism* (Madras, 1929) insisted on the traditional Indian approach towards the basic concepts which characterised all the major forms of the Indian religious systems.[21]

With the exception of Niharranjan Ray's *Brahmanical Gods in Burma* (Calcutta, 1932)—which dealt with the Mons of Lower Burma and other Hinduised tribes worshipping Viṣṇu and other principal Hindu deities as was attested by local inscriptions in Sanskrit and Pyu languages, but in Indian scripts, and also by the sculptural remains—and B. Kumarappa's *The Hindu Conception of the Deity* (London, 1934) which was a subjective interpretation of the Hindu approach to the divine in conformity with what had been suggested by the texts leading to the qualified monism of

[20]In A. Bertholet and E. Lahmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, Tubingen, 1925. Cf. S. Konow and P. Tuxen, *The Religions of India*, Copenhagen, 1949.

[21]His other works are *What is Hinduism?* Benares, 1940, and *Studies in the Renaissance of Hinduism*, Benares, 1944.

Rāmānuja, done from a syncretistic outlook, most of the works of the subsequent periods—barring those dealing with specialised themes—belonged to the category of introducing in a general way the basic features of the Indian religious systems and facts about Indian deities to the Western readers—not in that sophisticated form which found its expression in the works of Barth, Hopkins or Monier-Williams—but in a simpler but more straightforward way without any special bias. A typical example of such attempts was H. Von Glasenapp's *Die Religionen Indiens* (Stuttgart, 1943). A.C. Bouquet's *Hinduism* (London, 1948) should also be mentioned in connection, though this work had a slight missionary bias. The Indian attitude was reflected in such works as J.N. Banerjea's *The Gods and Goddesses of India*,[22] which was meant especially for the lay-readers, A.P. Karmarkar's *The Religions of India* (Lonavala, 1950), S.C. Chatterjee's *The Fundamentals of Hinduism* (Calcutta, 1950), etc.

A collection of articles, mostly by Indian scholars, was published from New York in 1953 which was edited by K.W. Morgan under the title *The Religion of the Hindus*. The purpose of this work was to show what the Hindus themselves regarded as essential to their religion, Louis Renou's *Religions of Ancient India* (London, 1953) served as a brilliant introduction to pre-Muslim Hinduism by one of the leading Sanskritists of modern times. The book reminded of the earlier masterpieces of Barth, Hopkins and Monier-Williams but bore no stamp of academic arrogance and subjective theorisations by which the works of these earlier writers were characterised. The author maintained a low profile all through and tried to present facts in an historical outline beginning from the earliest period to the medieval age as he understood them in his own way and this had given the book a greater credibility. P.D. Mehta's *Early Indian Religious Thought: An Introduction and Essay* (London, 1956) was a significant contribution to the religious studies of the fifties. The author, who spent most part of his life in Europe and claimed to be thoroughly well-versed in Christian theology and Western culture, wanted to convey to the West the message that in all the diversities of the Indian religious systems there was a fundamental unity common to all. The first part of this work was an historical treatment in five big chapters which dealt respectively with pre-Vedic religious thought, the Vedas, the Upaniṣads, the Buddha and his teachings and the *Bhagavadgītā*. In his historical analysis he

[22] *Introducing India*, I, 1947.

had followed the approach and methodology of the Western scholars, in most cases having agreement with their views. But on various points he also differed, and the points on which he was not in sympathy with the evaluations and judgements of the Western scholars were included among the questions in the second part of the book which dealt respectively with the following topics: Hinduism and the Buddha; The World: Māyā, Reality, Buddhi; Interpretations of Some Teachings; God-conception; Karma: Justice, Redemption; Sin: Good and Evil; Ethic and Transcendental Ethic; and Religion and Religions: Nirvāṇa, Love. The second part is reflective, but in all cases supported by textual evidence, and the learned author tried to make a synthesis of all the diverse phenomena from a point of view which appeared to the present author as something Vedantic. While describing the religions of India, Mehta had occasionally drawn upon other religious teachings especially upon those of the *Old* and *New Testament*. Among other important publications of the fifties mention should be made of V. Raghavan's *The Indian Heritage* (Bangalore, 1958) which was a representative selection from the Sanskrit sources from the *Ṛgveda* to the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. The English translation of Max Weber's *Hinduismus und Buddhismus*, based on a sociological approach, was published in 1958.[23]

The first edition of *The Cultural Heritage of India*, in three volumes and about 2,000 pages, the work of one hundred distinguished Indian scholars edited by H.D. Bhattacharyya, was published in 1937 by the Sri Ramakrishna Birth Centenary Publication Committee as a birth-centenary memorial. This work presented for the first time a panorama of the cultural history of India, and it was immediately acclaimed as a remarkable contribution to the cultural literature and the world. The second enlarged edition in four volumes appeared in the fifties.[24] Part III of the first volume was devoted to the Vedic Civilization which contained the following chapters: The Religious-philosophic Culture of India (T.M.P. Mahadevan), The Vedas and Their Religious Teachings (Swami Sharvananda), Vedic Culture (C. Kunhan Raja), Vedic Rituals (V.M. Apte), The Vedāṅgas (V.M. Apte), Yāska and Pāṇini (V.S. Agrawala), Vedic Exegisis (Shrimat Anirvan), The Dawn of Indian Philosophy (Swami Ghanananda), A Bird's eye view of the

[23] The original German version came out from Tubingen in 1921.

[24] Vol. I, 1958; vol. II, 1962; vol. III 1953; vol. IV, 1956.

Upaniṣads (Swami Madhavananda), Mystical Approach in the Upaniṣad (M.N. Sircar), and Upaniṣadic Meditation (Swami Gambhirananda). Part IV dealt with Buddhism and Jainism under the following chapters: Śramaṇa or non-Brahmanical Sects (N. Aiyaswami Sastri), Jainism: Its History, Principles and Precepts (H.L. Jain), Jainism: Its Philosophy and Ethics (Appaswami Chakravarti), Some Fundamental Principles of Jainism (Sukhlalji Sanghvi), Schools and Sects of Buddhism (P.V. Bapat and N. Dutt), Emergence of Mahāyāna Buddhism (N. Dutt), Mahayanic Pantheon (B.T. Bhattacharyya), Karma (B.C. Law), Nirvāṇa (B.C. Law), Buddhism in relation to Vedānta (V.S. Bhattacharya), and Buddhism in Indian Thought and Life (Satkari Mookerjee). The second volume was devoted to the Itihāsas, Purāṇas, Dharma and other Śāstras. Part one of this volume dealt with the two great epics under the following chapters: Classical Sanskrit as a Vehicle of Indian Culture (K.K. Handique), The Rāmāyaṇa: Its History and Character (A.D. Pusalker), The Culture of the Rāmāyaṇa (Swami Nihsreyasananda), The Mahābhārata: Its History and Character (P.L. Vaidya and A.D Pusalker), The Mahābhārata: Aspects of Its Culture (H.C. Raychaudhuri), Religion and Philosophy of the Epics (A.P. Karmarkar), The Influence of the Epics on Indian Life and Literature (N.M. Sen), and the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata in South-East Asia (B.R. Chatterjee). Part II dealt with the *Gītā* literature under the following chapters: The Bhagavadgītā: A General Review of Its History and Character (S.K. Belvalkar), The Teachings of the Bhagavadgītā (Swami Suddhananda), The Religion of the Bhagavadgītā (Swami Tapasyananda), The Bhagavadgītā: Its Synthetic Character (Swami Vireswarananda), The Bhagavadgītā: Its Early Commentaries (M.N. Sarkar), and Imitations of Bhagavadgītā and Later Gītā Literature (P.S. Aiyar). Part III dealt with the Purāṇas under the following chapters: Indian Mythology (R.N. Dandekar), The Purāṇas (R.C. Hazra), The Upapurāṇas (R.C. Hazra), and the Ethics of the Purāṇas (C.S. Venkateswaran). Part IV dealt with the Dharmaśāstras. The chapters useful for our purpose were: The Dharmasūtras and the Dharmaśāstras (V.A. Ramaswami Sastri), The Smṛtis (T.R. Venkatarama Sastri), The Nibandhas (D.C. Bhattacharyya), The Manusaṃhitā (V. Raghavan), Penances and Vows (D.C. Bhattacharyya) and The Hindu Sacraments (R.B. Pandey). The third was devoted to philosophy which contained the following chapters: Rise of the Philosophical Schools (T.R.V. Murti), The Sāṅkhya (M. Hiriyanna), Yoga (H.D. Bhattacharyya), Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (S. Mookherjee), Navya Nyāya (J.V. Bhattacharyya), Pūrvamīmāṃsā (P.N. Tarkabhushan), Materialists, Sceptics and Agnostics (D.R. Shastri), Brahmamīmāṃsā (A.K. Sastri), Essentials of Vedānta (V. Subrahmanya Iyer), Philosophy of Śaṅkara (S.N. Bhattacharya), The Advaita and Its Spiritual Significance (K.C. Bhattacharyya), Post-Śaṅkara Advaita (D.C. Bhattacharyya), Philosophy of the Bhāgavata (Swami Tyagisananda), The Viśiṣṭādvaita of Rāmānuja (P.N. Srinivasachari), Madhva's Brahmamīmāṃsā (H.N. Raghavendrachar), The Nimbārka School of Vedānta (Rama Chaudhuri), The School of Vallabha (G.H. Bhatt), Bhedābheda School of Vedānta (P.N. Srinivasachari), The Acintyabhedābheda School (R.G. Nath), The Philosophy of Śaivism (S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri), The Path of the *Gītā* (D.S. Sarma), Philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha (B.L. Atreya), Philosophy of the Tantras (Swami Pratyagatmananda), The Philosophy of Mysticism (R.K. Mukerjee), Philosophy in Popular Literature (A.N. Bose). Religion of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika (G.N. Jha), Nature of the Soul (A.C. Mukerji), Nature of the Physical World (V. Mishra), Nature of Mind and Its Activities (P.T. Raju), Extra-sensory and Superconscious Experiences (Swami Akhilananda), Indian Theism (Swami Hiranmayananda), Indian Epistemology (D.M. Datta), The Art of Philosophical Disputation (Y.N. Bagchi), Indian Psychology (P.T. Raju), Types of Human Nature (H.M. Bhattacharyya), Indian Ethics (H.D. Bhattacharyya), and Philosophy of Values (M. Hiriyanna).The fourth volume dealt exclusively with religion. Besides the introduction of Bhagavan Das, it contained 47 chapters distributed in six parts. Part I under the title 'Religious Sects and Cults' contained the following chapters: Evolution of Religio-philosophic Culture in India (R.C. Majumdar), An Historical Sketch of Śaivism (K.A. Nilakanta Sastri), Kashmir Śaivism (Arabinda Basu), Vīraśaivism (Sree Kumaraswamiji), Early History of Vaiṣṇavism (D.C. Sircar), Bhāgavata Religion: the Cult of Bhakti (J.N. Sinha), The Vaikhānasas (K.R. Venkataraman), Historical Evolution of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism (V. Rangacharya). A Survey of Caitanya Movement (R.G. Nath), Śaṅkaradeva and the Vaiṣṇava Movements in Assam (R.M. Nath), Evolution of the Tantras (P.C. Bagchi), Tantra as a Way of Realization (Swami Pratyagatmananda), The Spirit and Culture of the Tantras (Atal Behari Ghosh), Śakti Cult in South

India (K.R. Venkataraman), Tāntrika Culture among the Buddhists (B.T. Bhattacharyya), The Cult of the Buddhist Siddhācaryas (P.C. Bagchi), The Nātha Cult (Sukumar Sen), Some Later Yogic Schools (S.B. Dāsgupta), The Doctrinal Culture and Tradition of the Siddhas (V.V. Ramana Sastri), Skanda Cult in South India (K.R. Venkataraman), The Religion of the Sikh Gurus (Teja Singh), and Cult Syncretism (J.N. Banerjea). Part II dealing with the saints and their teachings comprised the following chapters: The Śaiva Saints of South India (S. Satchidanandam Pillai), The Vaiṣṇava Saints of Karnataka, (B.N.K. Sharma), The Maharastra Saints and Their Teachings (K.V. Gajendragadkar), The Medieval Mystics of North India (K.M. Sen), Tulasīdāsa and His Teachings (C.K. Handoo), and Śakti Worship and the Śākta Saints (C.H. Chakravarti). Part III dealing with 'Religion in Practice' contained the following chapters: Religious Beliefs of the Indian Tribes (T.C. Das), Hindu Religious Symbolism (Swami Yatiswarananda), Rituals of Worship (L.A. Ravi Varma), Indian Hymnology (S.P. Bhattacharyya), Festivals and Sacred Days (B.N. Bhattacharyya), Pilgrimage and Fairs (Swami Pavitrananda), Methods of popular Religious Instructions (V. Raghavan), and Diffusion of Socio-religious Culture (K.N. Mitra and A. Bhattacharyya). Part IV dealt with Religious from beyond the Borders, Part V with Some Modern Reform Movements, and Part VI with Sri Ramakrishna and Spiritual Renaissance.

The varieties of the contents of the *Cultural Heritage*, so extensively quoted here, proved to be very interesting and useful to the students of Indian religion and culture. They represented more or less the typical Indian attitude, what the Indian scholars, notwithstanding the impact of Western ideas in their approach, thought about their own religious systems, and some of the contributors were well-versed in traditional learning. Moreover, taken together, all the chapters written on diverse subjects show a basic conceptual unity underlying all the religious systems of India. There was another serious and concerted attempt to present the history of the Indian religious systems showing their origin and development in a chronological sequence in the *History and Culture of the Indian People* series (1951–57) published by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan of Bombay under the general editorship of R.C. Majumdar.[25] Pre-

[25] *The Vedic Age*, London, 1951, chs. VIII, IX, XI, XVIII, XXII, XXVI; *The Age of Imperial Unity*, Bombay, 1951, ch. XIX; *The Classical Age*, Bombay, 1954, ch. XVIII; *The*

viously such an attempt was made by the Western scholars in the *Cambridge History of India*, vol. I (1922) in which the religion of the *Ṛgveda*, the later Saṃhitās, the Brāhmaṇas, the Āraṇyakas and the Upaniṣads were discussed by A.B. Keith and the history of the Jains by J. Charpentier. These were, however, very inadequately treated. In the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan series 525 pages were devoted to the history of religion and philosophy. In the first volume of this series S.K. Chatterji dealt with the contributions of the Austric and Dravidian peoples to the development of Indian religious ideas; A.D. Pusalker with the Harappan religion, especially focussing on the Mother Goddess, the prototype of Śiva and worship of animal, tree, fire and water; B.K. Ghosh with Indo-Iranian relations showing the cleavage between the early Aryans of India and Iran, antagonism between the Daiva and Asura gods and the reforms of Zarathustra; and V.M. Apte with Vedic religion in three parts, the first describing the origin, nature and classification of the Ṛgvedic deities and also the principles of sacrifice, philosophy and ethical and spiritual thought as found in the *Ṛgveda*; the second presenting the religion of the later Saṃhitās and the Brāhmaṇas which special reference to the magic formulae, philosophical hymns, grand sacrifices, groups of priests, the deities, ethical ideas, concept of heaven and hell, the circuit of birth and death, etc.; and the third discussing the religion and philosophy of the Upaniṣads and Sūtras with special emphasis on the protest against rituals, identity of Brahman with *ātman*, doctrine of *prāṇa*, transmigration of the soul, fundamental doctrines of the Upaniṣads, the Śrauta and Gṛhya rituals, meaning and nature of sacrifice, different classes of priests, magic and rituals and ethical concepts.

The remaining four volumes dealt with the history of Buddhism, Jainism, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor religious sects. Buddhism was dealt with by N. Dutt under the following sections in the second, third and fourth volumes. The Buddha (early and missionary life), Dhamma, Saṅgha (ordination, dress, food and medicine, *uposatha* and fortnightly assembly, *vassāvāsa* or rainy season retreat, special rules for the nuns, constitution), History of Buddhism (the four stages and rise of Mahāyānism), The Hīnayāna, The Mahāyāna (ethics of Mahāyāna, monastic life, Mahāyāna doctrines, concep-

Age of Imperial Kanauj, Bombay, 1955, ch. XI; *The Struggle for Empire*, Bombay, 1956, ch. XVI. Another publication of Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan on religion was D.S. Sharma's *Hinduism Through the Ages*, Bombay, 1956.

tions of the Buddha and Bodhisattva), (The forms of worship, Geographical Distribution of Hīnayāna and Mādhyamika and Yogācāra), Historical Survey, Doctrinal Changes (Emergence of Tantrism, Dhāraṇīs, Avalokiteśvara and Tārā, Early Tantric Texts, The Two Schools of Tantric Teachers, and Distinction between Tantrism and Mahāyānism) and Historical Review under the subsections Traditional Account by Tāranātha and Patronage of the Pāla kings. This history was continued by N.N. Dasgupta in the fifth volume under the following sections: Doctrinal Changes (Tantric Buddhism, Vajrayāna, Kālacakrayāna and Sahajayāna), Sphere of Influence (Pāla kingdom, Kashmir, Madhyadeśa and South India) and The Last Phase. The Pali canon was dealt with by A.D. Pusalker and the Buddhist images by J.N. Banerjea who also dealt with the icons of Jainism, Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and minor religious sects. In the second and third volumes Jainism was dealt with by A.M. Ghatage under such categories as Pārśva and Mahāvīra, Jainism after Mahāvīra, Jain Doctrines, Jain Canon, Jain Philosophy and Spread of Jainism in North India, Deccan and South India. The spread of Jainism in the aforesaid regions along with Jain literature and general observations were dealt with by A.D. Pusalker in the fourth volume while Jainism in Gujarat, Deccan and South India along with Jain literature, ascetic organisation and succession lists by H.L. Jain in the fifth volume. Vaiṣṇavism was dealt with by V.M. Apte and D.C. Sircar under the following sections. The Origin, the Evolution of Vaiṣṇavism, Bhagavadgītā, Doctrine of Four Vyūhas, Relation of Vaiṣṇavism with other Creeds, the Avatāras of Viṣṇu, Śrī or Lakṣmī, Viṣṇu Mythology in Epigraphic Records, Viṣṇu Worship in Far South, the Ācāryas, Yāmunācārya, Rāmānuja, Rāmānuja's Followers, Nimbārka and Mādhva. Śaivism was done all through by T.M.P. Mahadevan under the following sections: The Pāśupatas, Śaivism, as a popular Cult, it spread in North and South India, Kashmir, Śaivism, Śaṅkarācārya Royal Patrons of Śaivism, Vīraśaivism, Śaiva Siddhānta and Śivādvaita. A section on the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas was written by R.C. Majumdar. The minor religious sects were dealt with by H.D. Bhattacharyya which comprised the Ājīvikas, Prajāpati-Brahmā, Sūrya, Śrī or Lakṣmī, Nāga or serpent worship, Vaiṣṇava gods, Śakti cult and Śaiva deities, miscellaneous deities and religious syncretism. The chapters on philosophy dealing with all the major systems were contributed by U.C. Bhattacharjee. Besides, the chapters on language and literature and on architecture and sculpture added much on religious matters.

The second volume of the *Comprehensive History of India* (ed. by K.A. Nilakanta Sastri, Calcutta, 1957) which dealt with the period by 325 BC and AD 300, contained a chapter of 75 pages entitled 'Religious Movements' written by K.A.N. Sastri, R.B. Joshi, P.C. Bagchi, J.N. Banerjea and M. Yamunachariar. Its approach was purely historical. It began with the history of Jainism after Mahāvīra with emphasis on the history of Jain church and spread of Jainism upto its Mathura phase. Buddhism from the Śuṅga to Kuṣāṇa period was also discussed along with the growth of its eighteen sects and rise of Mahāyānism. Vaiṣṇavism was treated under various sections dealing with the beginnings of the *bhakti* school centering on Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and in some early Buddhist and Jain texts, Vāsudeva in Pāṇini, Patañjali and *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*, references to the worshippers of Vāsudeva in the classical literature, the worship of the Vīras, the essential tenets of the Bhāgavata cult, the introduction of the *vyūha* doctrine in the cult and the elimination of the worship of Śāmba, growth of the Bhāgavata cult and the question of its getting influenced by Christianity. Śaivism was likewise treated under the following categories: Rudra Śiva, the central cult picture of Śaivism; the Sibae of the *Annalists* of Alexander's invasion and the Śivapura of *Mahābhāṣya* and Mahāmāyurī; Rudra and Śiva in the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* and the *Mahābhārata*; Patañjali's reference to the Śiva-Bhāgavatas; the Pāśupatas, their origin as determined by archaeological and literary data, a later phase of the Śiva-Bhāgavatas; Śiva worshippers in the different parts of northern India; association of phallicism with the cult of Śiva; and its prevalence in Central and Southern India. Among other religious systems, separate sections were dedicated to Śāktism, the Sauras or sun-worshippers, and worshippers of Kārttikeya and Gaṇapati. Besides the historical treatment some special sections were devoted to the religious and philosophical thought of Jainism with special reference to its cosmology, logic and theory of knowledge; of Buddhism with emphasis on the concept of Nirvāṇa and the doctrines of the four schools of the Vaibhāṣikas, Sautrāntikas, Mādhyamikas and Yogācāras; and of Hinduism in terms of its six philosophical systems with details on the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta.

A few works of Indian scholarship published during the fifties and the sixties deserve special mention, J.N. Sinha's *The Foundation*

of Hinduism (Calcutta, 1955) and T.M.P. Mahadevan's *Outlines of Hinduism* (Bombay, 1956) although meant to be a general introduction to a vast and complicated subject like Hinduism, the basic philosophical approach of both the scholars was able to put forward the essence and the key concepts, and as such their importance could hardly be minimised. The next was K.R. Srinivasan's *Some Aspects of Religion as Revealed by the Early Monuments and Literature of the South* (Madras, 1959–60).[26] Although there had never been any dearth of works on South Indian religious systems, the volume under review presented up to date informations. A completeness of the study of the south Indian religious systems was also found in K.A. Nilakanta Sastri's *Development of Religion in South India* (Madras, 1963). Both these works were able to fill the gaps which existed in the field of South Indian religious studies. To the same category belonged Sudhakar Chattopadhyaya's *Evolution of Theistic Sects in Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1962). Although the history and doctrines as well as the socio-economic milieu of the rise of sectarian theism in time and space became subjects of extensive researches since the days of H.H. Wilson and R.G. Bhandarkar, and numerous works published meanwhile, there was an essential need to harmonise the results of researches in a systematic form and to present facts in an historical outline so that the hazy idea became clear and the process of historical development came to light in its entirety. The work was thus able to compensate a long-felt want. It dealt with from the earliest period to the age of Śaṅkarâcârya. The author, we are told, had an intention to bring out a second volume to deal with the post-Śaṅkara developments, but the idea was not unfortunately materialised.

Among other works of interest, *Hinduism*, edited by Louis Renou (New York, 1961)[27] endeavoured to present passages from among works on Śruti (tradition based among revelation), Smṛti (tradition based on memory), epics and classical texts upon which Hinduism was built and in which its mythology, its beliefs and practices were expressed. According to the editor of this volume, who happened to be a leading Sanskritist of our times, India assumed a crucial role in the encounter of the East and the West, and as such it was imperative to understand those forces which characterised the essential spirit of India. Since Hinduism was regarded as one of the most dominant forces, it was presented in this volume in the full sweep of its historical evolution an influence as well as in its integral structure as a way of life. "Hinduism is precious primarily because of its sources; and these sources are the texts which help us observe the creation or at least the establishment and development of the great spiritual disciplines which are the very foundation of Hinduism." The editor's introduction to it was a wide-ranging study of both the history and structure of Hinduism. It treated of the general characteristics of Hinduism, their roots in the Vedic tradition, and the trends in the literary expression of Hinduism through the ages. The major part of the introduction was devoted to Hindu beliefs and practices, rituals and myths, ethical aesthetical values, philosophy and the spiritual path. The final section of the introduction discussed the phenomenon of the sects and castes and the general role of Hinduism in Indian society, past and future. The selection of texts spans the entire history of Hindu tradition—from the earliest known hymns, epics, and moral treatises to the writings of Tagore, Gandhi and Radhakrishnan. The selections had been carefully chosen to illustrate not only the many aspects of Hindu belief but the varying traditions in its history and their relation to the main stream. Arranged historically, the selections were each prefaced by an informative introductory note by the editor.

R.C. Zaehner's *Hinduism* (Oxford, 1962) was a work of great merit which had succeeded, without any undue or misleading over-simplification, in enabling the uninstructed reader to grasp the essence of what a Hindu meant by his own religion. Zaehner was chiefly concerned with the essential concepts that underlie the changing surface of Hindu tradition. He traced the key concepts through the four-thousand-year development of Hinduism and into the modern world where Hinduism is undergoing the latest of many re-definitions. According to the author, "Hinduism is, in fact, both a Hellenism and a Judaism: it is both a way of life and a highly organised social and religious system, but unlike Judaism, the essence of which is submission to the One God who is personal, transcendent and holy, who reveals himself in history and acts in history, Hinduism is quite free from any dogmatic affirmations concerning the nature of God, and the core of religion is never felt to depend on the existence or non-existence of God, or on whether there is one God or many; for it is perfectly possible to be

[26] *Sankara Parvati Endowment Lectures*, Madras University.

[27] *Great Religions of Modern Man Series*, general editor, R.A. Gard.

a good Hindu whether one's personal views incline towards monism, monotheism, polytheism, or even atheism. This is not what ultimately matters. If, then, God or the gods are not central to this strange complex of beliefs, what is?" Any writer, "if he tries to compress the whole of Hinduism's 4,000 odd years of history into some 200 pages, the reader will be utterly confused by a mass of apparently self-contradictory detail and will fail to decry that which is eternal and unchanging in this *dharma* he is studying. If, however, he picks and etches in high relief what seems to him to be the essence of this subtle so 'difficult to know' he may well be—and rightly—accused of presenting a picture of Hinduism that is neither scholarly nor objective. He must choose between producing a catalogue or school textbook which will give the student the maximum number of facts within a very limited compass, or he will attempt, at his peril, to distil from the whole mass of his material the fine essence that he considers to be the changeless ground from which the proliferating jungle that seems to be Hinduism grows. This is the course the present writer proposes to follow". With this end in view Zachner tried to trace the ancient roots of Hinduism and the process of the subtle blend of the mythological and metaphysical in it, insisting that Hinduism was far more than a quest for *mokṣa* or liberation. Apart from the introduction, the work contained eight chapters, the first five comprising the basic Hindu concepts of Veda, Brahman, Mokṣa, God and Dharma, all fully documented with textual references and quotations. The sixth chapter under the title 'Bhakti' dealt with the medieval *bhakti* movements and the seventh under the title 'Encounter' dealt with the changes and renovations in Hinduism after the British occupation of India. The eighth chapter was under a symbolic title 'Yudhiṣṭhira Returns' in which ideals of Gandhi and Tagore were discussed.

Alain Danilou's *Hindu Polytheism* (London, 1964, French original: *Le Polytheisme Hindu*, Paris, 1960) aimed at a subjective interpretation of the totality of Hinduism in 32 big chapters grouped under six books. The first on philosophy dealt with the theory of polytheism, nature of the ultimate and the cosmic being; the second on the gods of the Vedas; the third on the concept of Trinity represented by Viṣṇu, Śiva and Brahmā; the fourth on Śakti; the fifth on Secondary gods; and the sixth on Representations and Worship of Deities. According to Danielou, "Hinduism recognises

for each age and each place a new form of revelation, and for each men, according to his stage of development, a different path of realization, a different mode of worship, a different morality, different rituals, different god".

J.N. Banerjea's *Purāṇic and Tantric Religion* (Calcutta, 1966) was a collection of a series of lectures delivered by him in the Centre of Advanced Study of Ancient Indian History and Culture, University of Calcutta. It was an historical treatment. Lecture I served as the background in which the pre-Vedic and the Vedic religion was reviewed and to which the sources of the *bhakti* concept, the principal Puranic and Tantric cults, the ritualistic practices connected with the Puranic and Tantric systems, mythology and allied features were traced. Lectures II and III dealt with Vaiṣṇavism, its earlier designation, its earlier literary and epigraphical references, the role of *Bhagavadgītā*, the Ekāntika doctrine, the constituents, transformation of composite Bhāgavatism into Pāñcarātra, the essentials of the Pāñcarātra doctrines, the *vibhavas* of Vāsudeva-Viṣṇu, the Pāñcarātra literature and its contents, archaeological evidence regarding the progress of Bhāgavatism, Pāñcarātrism in the first few centuries of the Christian era, religion of the early Gupta rulers, Bhāgavatism in the later Gupta and early medieval periods, glyptic and monumental data regarding the prevalence of Bhāgavatism, and its wide spread in South India. Lectures IV and V dealt with Śaivism discussing the proto-Śiva of the early Indus Valley sites, phallism and other features, Vedic Rudra, *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* and the cult of Rudra Śiva, dawn of sectarianism, Śiva in various texts, archaeology and the beginnings of Śaivism, phallism in Śiva cult, references to Śiva-liṅga worship in literature, the probable reason of Śiva's being Vedabāhya, Śivabhāgavatas and Pāśupatas, historicity of Lakulīśa, the Ājīvikas and their possible association with the Śivabhāgavatas and the Pāśupatas, Pāśupata religion as described in various texts, the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, general prevalence of the Pāśupata cult in the Gupta and post-Gupta ages, the tenets of the Śaiva system, the Mattamayūras and the emblems and icons in Śiva worship. Lecture VI was devoted to the Śakti worship and Tantrism dealing with the worship of the Female Principle in the pre-Vedic times, place of goddess worship in the early Vedic texts, mention in the Vedic texts of several goddesses at the centres of Śakti worship, various names and aspects of Śakti in the epic period, progress of Śakti worship,

hymns dedicated to the goddess in different texts, the nature of the Śakti-pīṭha concept, various aspects of Śakti worship, Tantrism in relation to Śakti worship, Ḍākinīs and Yoginīs, some Śākta shrines of Orissa, the light thrown by them on the Tantric form of the goddess, the Chaurasī Vārahī temple, and the element of eroticism and sensual love in Tantric Śāktism. Besides there were chapters on the cults of Sūrya, Kārttikeya and Gaṇésa. Sun cult was dealt with under the following categories: Early Vedic references to Sūrya and his various aspects, Ādityas and Navagrahas, sun in mythology, additional literary and archaeological data on sun-worship, the indigenous school of the Sauras noticed in the *Śaṅkaravijaya*, foreign influence on the north Indian sun cult, foreign literary data about the reoriented form of sun-worship in India, medieval sun icons of north India and the continuance of the sun-worship. The worship of Kārttikeya had been treated with reference to all archaeological and literary references to it up to the Gupta period. The chapter on Gaṇapati and the Gāṇapatyas comprised an introduction on the antecedents of Gaṇapati-Gaṇeśa, literary and archaeological data on Gaṇapati worship and the continuance of Gaṇapati worship in subsequent times.

P. Banerjee's *Early Indian Religions* (New Delhi, 1973) aimed at presenting an historical account of some aspects of India's religious life of the post-Mauryan period, i.e. 185 BC to AD 300. The first or introductory chapter of this volume was devoted mainly to the study of the origin, growth and nature of what had been characterised as Neo-Brahmanism by the author. According to him, this Neo-Brahmanism was the same as incipient Hinduism which was based on catholicity and receptibility and served as a synthesis of polygenous religious ideas, historical and popular, Vedic and non-Vedic, a compromise between the speculation of the intellectual and emotionalism of the masses. The second chapter dealt with the history of Śaivism which, according to the author, was not a single cult but a bundle of cults which was amply testified by the varied and manifold characteristics attributed to Rudra-Śiva in Vedic and post-Vedic literature. A few other points of interest in this chapter were concerned with the discussion of (i) the historical development of the Rudra-Śiva cult, (ii) the wide popularity of this cult among all sections of people, native and foreign, and (iii) Liṅga-worship and its association with Śaivism, etc. While the third and the fourth chapters were devoted respectively to a detailed

study of Bhāgavatism and Nāga worship, the fifth chapter tried to show that there was a continuity of orthodox practices in the framework of Neo-Brahmanism, notwithstanding the overwhelming popularity of the sectarian cults. The historic and popular forms of worship were so intimately mixed up that they could be separated only by an act of abstraction. The sixth and seventh chapters described the history of Jainism and Buddhism. The popularity of these two religious sects was illustrated by the author by a large number of contemporary inscriptions and architectural remains. All the chapters were based upon a comprehensive and critical study of contemporary archaeological, numismatic and epigraphic materials. Traditions and evidence of literature were popularly utilised to supplement the archaeological studies and link up the narrative as it was necessary.

We like to conclude this chapter with reference to S.R. Goyal's *A Religious History of Ancient India* (upto *c.* AD 1200 in two volumes, Meerut, 1984). According to the author, most of the works written on ancient Indian religions either discussed particular sects, schools or texts, or the religious condition of a region or period and such other topics. Secondly, most of the books on ancient Indian religious history were written either without any particular approach in minds and sought to offer a bare outline of the chronological evolution of a particular religious historical viewpoint. Thirdly, results of recent researchers on different aspects of Indian religions were not incorporated in a comprehensive volume. This is why the author sought to describe the entire ancient Indian religious history in one work, divided for the sake of convenience into two volumes. The author claimed that in the present work a wider approach was adopted, for wherever possible he had discussed not only the role of various factors—cultural, political, economic, etc.—operating in society behind the origin, nature and evolution of every religion, but had also delineated the role of that religion as a factor of social change. Moreover, the work sought to incorporate, critically examine and synthesize the results of recent researchers. The first volume dealt exclusively and in detail with pre-Vedic, Vedic, Jain and Buddhist religions. Its twelve chapters were successively entitled: Prehistoric Origins of Indian Religions; Religion of the Indus Civilization; The Early Vedic Religion; Religion of the Middle Vedic Age; Religion and Philosophy of the Later Vedic Age; Non-Buddhist and Non-Jain Religio-Philosophical

Sects; Jainism upto Mahāvīra; Jainism after Mahāvīra; Gautama Buddha and Early Buddhism; Mahāyāna and Tantric phase. The nineteen chapters of the second volume were successively entitled: Origin and Sources of Smārta and Epico-Purāṇic Religion; Epico-Purāṇic Pantheon and Avatāravāda; Bhakti and Purāṇic Rituals; Vaiṣṇavism: Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa and Pāñcarātra; Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa and Bhāgavatism; Evolution, Growth and Spread of Vaiṣṇavism; Origin and Development of Śaivism; Sects of Śaivism; Śāktism; The Saura Cult; Gaṇapati and Gāṇapatya Sect; Skanda-Kārttikeya; other Gods and Cults; Tantric Hinduism; Christianity and Zoroastrianism; and Islam. The author had the enthusiasm not only to compile different interpretations, but also the acumen of a critical researcher. The interweaving of the history of diverse sects with the general development of religions in India was a noteworthy feature of this work. Barring its excessive concern with the compiling of all kinds of opinion, this work had been a distinctly useful contribution to the history of ancient Indian religions.

CHAPTER 7

Studies on the Theistic Sects and Miscellaneous Cults

I

The monotheistic sectarian religions such as Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, Śāktism and other systems, which constituted a fluctuating mass of beliefs, opinions, usages, observances, religious and social ideas and in which a certain common ground-principle may be recognised, were studied by all writers on Hinduism from various points of view and we have already had the occasion to deal with them in the two preceding chapters. Earlier writers like Barth, Monier-Williams, Hopkins, etc. held that their rise was in general due to the unsatisfactory nature of the old Brahminical theology, the divinities of which had gradually retired and disappeared behind a host of subtle abstractions to affect consciousness of the masses. But the formulators of these systems who channelised the religious feelings of the masses did not, like the Buddhists or the Jains, openly sever all connection with the past. The sectarian religions must have been of ancient origin, though their history was comparatively modern, their common characteristic being the concept of the Supreme Being ascribed to certain powerful popular deities by equating them with Śiva, Viṣṇu or any important god who, despite their Vedic origins, assumed a different kind of personality. The sectarian cults of Viṣṇu and Śiva were the essentials of Hinduism and other monotheistic cults, which also became integral part of Hinduism, were developed in imitation of the former two systems.

H.H. Wilsons's pioneering work[1] referred to in the preceding chapter—although it was devoted to the medieval period—referred to earlier sectarian divisions on the basis of Ānandagiri's *Śaṅkara-digvijaya* and Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* and showed that each of the two great divisions of the Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas embraced six principal subdivisions, the former comprising the Bhāktas, Bhāgavatas, Cakrinas or Pāñcarātrikas, Vaikhānasas and

[1] *Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus*, originally published in the *Asiatic Researches*, XVI–XVII, Calcutta, 1828–32, separately published in 1846 and reproduced in the first volume of his *Selected Works*, London, 1861.

Karmahīnas and the latter Śaivas, Raudras, Ugras, Bhāktas, Jaṅgamas and Pāśupatas. Apart from the Vaiṣṇavas and Śaivas, Wilson referred to Ānandagiri's and Mādhava's description of the worshippers of Brahmā or Hiraṇyagarbha, Agni, Trimūrti (Brahmā-Viṣṇu-Śiva combine), Sūrya, Gaṇapati and Śakti (its moderate and extremist factions). J. Muir in the fourth volume of his celebrated work[2] threw light on early Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism by citing copious passages which he had collected from the *Ṛgveda* and the *Atharvaveda*, the Brāhmaṇas, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the Purāṇas along with the opinions of the principal scholars who had occupied themselves with the subject. Lassen[3] was probably first to suggest the popular origin of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism. According to him, the *Mahābhārata* which in its existing redaction, was conceived in the interest of Vaiṣṇavism, the cult in practice which was widely spread was that of Śiva. Referring to the cult of Brahmā which occupied not a very significant position as a sectarian religion he said that as India was pre-eminently a country were nothing was lost, even as late as the fifteenth century a king of Vidyānagara in Mysore dedicated a temple to Brahmā. Lassen had also made an interesting suggestion that the first Hindu representations of a character unmistakably religious which could be found on coins of the Indo-Scythic kings about the beginning of the Christian era were Śaivite figures alternating with Buddhist symbols.

Among other earlier authors we may refer to Colebrooke who had treated of the Māheśvaras and the Pāśupatas in his Memoirs of the Philosophy of the Hindus.[4] Th. Foulkes translated a Śaivite text from the original Tamil[5] and published in 1863 a book under the title *Catechism of the Śaiva Religion*. Śāktism also created interest among Western scholars after the publication of the French translation of the Devīmāhātmya section of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* by E. Burnouf in 1824 and its Latin translation by L. Poley in 1831. Weber in his *Zwei Vedische Texte Über Omina und Portenta* had attempted to trace the origin of the Divine Mothers to the Vedas. The cruel aspects of this cult, especially those concerning sacrifices before the goddess, were more emphasised. Wilson also took no-

[2] *Original Sanskrit Texts*, first ed. in 4 vols., 1858–63 second ed. in 5 vols., 1870.

[3] *Indische Allerthumskunde*, 1843–62.

[4] *Miscellaneous Essays*, ed. Cowell, vol. I.

[5] *Śivaprakāśapattalai or The Elements of Śaiva Philosophy*, Madras, 1863; three Śaivite treatises were translated from Tamil by H.R. Hoisington in *JAOS*, IV.

tice of the Śāktas who according to him comprised almost two-third of the Hindu population of Bengal. The study of Śaivism received a qualitative change after the discovery of numerous Śaiva texts from Kashmir by G. Bühler.[6] A remarkable contribution to the nineteenth-century study of Vaiṣṇavism was made by Albrecht Weber in his work entitled *Über die Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī*.[7] In this work a chronologically determinable development in the deification of Kṛṣṇa and also of Rāma was traced. This view was made to rest on the parts of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* where Kṛṣṇa and Rāma were still represented as simple heroes, where they were not yet identified with the Supreme Being. But he held that, the Kṛṣṇa of the epic, a brave warlike prince, but above all very crafty, and of a singularly doubtful moral character retained in a marked way certain mythical elements. His father Vasudeva appeared synonymous with Vasu, an old name for the celestial genii 'the bright ones', and Devaki, which signified at once, 'the divine one' and 'the gambler' recalled the nymph of the waters, the woman-cloud, deceiving and many-formed Viśvarūpā who in the Veda was the wife of Vivasvat. According to Senart[8] the Kṛṣṇa myths, which had a striking similarity of detail with the Buddha legends, indicated a figure of complex quality in which there mingled at length the myths of fire, lightning and storm of heaven and the sun.

Weber in his *Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī* tried to establish a theory that the *bhakti* doctrine of Vaiṣṇavism was influenced by Christianity. We have previously had the occasion to refer to this theory which we like to deal here with some detail. Weber referred to a *Mahābhārata* legend in which it was said that Nārada had visited the Śvetadvīpa or the White Island where he found the perfect practice of the Bhāgavata doctrine which, according to him, was a reminiscence of relations between the Brāhmaṇas and Alexandrian Christianity. He also laid stress on the monotheistic character of Vaiṣṇavism, on the analogy which existed between the theory of *avatāras* and that of the Incarnation, the similarities between the legends of Jesus and those of Kṛṣṇa—the pastoral scenes of the nativity, the adoration of the shepherds and the magi, the flight into Egypt, the massacre of innocents, the miracles connected with infancy, the

[6] Account published by him in *JRAS*, Bombay, XII, extra no. 77 ff.

[7] *Kṛṣṇa's Geburts fest*, Akademie der Wisenchaften, Berlin, 1867.

[8] *La Legende du Buddha, son Caractere et ses Origines*, Paris, 1873.

temptation and the transfiguration—and ceremonies of the Kṛṣṇa cult, like the festival of the nativity, the worship of infant Kṛṣṇa, etc. M.F. Lorinser[9] also supported the hypothesis of Weber and went so far as to arrive at the singular conclusion that the author of the *Bhagavadgītā* was well read in the Gospels. E. Renan[10] held that the resemblances became particularly striking when referred to the apocryphal Gospels, especially the Gospel of the Infancy, which was in great repute all over Asia. Weber's hypothesis was also supported by F. Neve.[11] The whole question of the ancient effects of Christianity was reviewed and analysed by C.P. Tiele[12] and J. Muir.[13] Because of its highly speculative character and lack of dependable evidence in its favour this theory of Weber received a diminishing importance in the course of time. R.G. Bhandarkar suggested that the Ābhīra tribe which migrated to India in the early centuries of the Christian era brought with them the stories connected with the early life of Jesus Christ and many of these in the course of time were transferred to the Kṛṣṇite mythology. This view was rejected by H.C. Raychaudhuri on reasonable ground as we shall see later.

Wilson in his aforesaid work said about the Vaiṣṇavas of Bengal that their religion could be summed up in one word *bhakti*. Weber and Lorinser also insisted on this *bhakti* element. Monier-Williams made a difference between the higher and lower forms of the Indian religious systems. The former category comprising "the higher, cultured and thoughtful classes" was described by him as Brahminism and the latter category comprising "the lower uncultured and unthinking masses". Ignoring the question of interrelation and intermixture between the two categories, he placed the monistic Upaniṣadic-Vedāntic content under the former and the monotheistic cults of the personal deities and related sects under the latter. He defined *bhakti* as monotheism in its Western technical sense, i.e. as a religion of love and devotion for a personal god. It was against this backdrop that George A. Grierson[14] constructed an historical account of Vaiṣṇavism and called it "the ancient

[9] *Die Bhagvadgītā übersetzt und erläutert*, 1869.

[10] *L'Eglise Chrétienne*, 515.

[11] *Des Elements Etrangers du Mythe et du Culte de Krishna*, 1876.

[12] *Christus in Krishna*, 1877.

[13] *Metrical Translation from Sanskrit Writers* 1879 in which a highly exhaustive and impartial resumé was given.

[14] Bhakti-Mārga in *ERE*, II, 1909, 539–51.

monotheistic religion of India" having traced its antecedents in the religion of the Bhāgavatas and in the Ekāntika-dharma mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*. He also linked the medieval Hindi *bhakta* poets with the ancient religion of *bhakti*, and described the religious movements led by them as the collective expression of its resurgence during the medieval period. According to him Vaiṣṇavism was a religion which was as monotheistic as Christianity.

It was, however, in the *magnum opus* of Sir R.G. Bhandarkar[15] that we come across for the first time a detailed account of all the sectarian religions based upon a careful and critical evaluation of the available data and presented in an historical outline with convincing arguments. According to him the major Upaniṣads do not invariably teach 'a system of pantheism' but tell us about 'various systems of doctrines as regards the nature of God, man and the world, and the relations between them'. He was the first to interpret the Nārāyaṇīya section of the *Mahābhārata*, the passage of the Buddhist *Niddesa* commentary referring to the existence of various cults and sects, the *Indica* of Megasthenes mentioning the Sātvatas, the worship of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, the cities of Mathura, and Kṛṣṇapura, etc. and other hitherto unexplored sources in their historical, doctrinal and philosophical perspective. He pointed out that the *Bhagavadgītā* was the earliest exposition of the *bhakti* system and placed the *Gītā* in or about the fourth century B.C. He used the non-mention of the doctrine of Vyūha of the Pāñcarātrins in the *Gītā* and the mention of at least two of the Vyūhas in the Ghosundi (or rather Nagari) inscription as an argument for placing the text at a much earlier date. He effectively demonstrated how the concept of cosmic Viṣṇu had been gradually absorbed in Hari-Kṛṣṇa on the basis of the epic and Puranic literature of the early post-Christian period. The other constituent unit, according to him, was the Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa element. He also dealt with the *bhakti* movements of northern and southern India of the medieval period with reference to the saint-poets and the Ācāryas and their social and philosophical teachings. Bhandarkar held that the Vedic Rudra was the precursor of the epic and Puranic Śiva and that "the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* stands at the door of the *bhakti* school, and pours its loving adoration on Rudra-Śiva instead of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa as the *Bhagavadgītā* did in later times when the *bhakti* doctrine was in full swing. In the *Śvetāśvatara* verses describing the god Īśāna as

[15] *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems*, Strassburg, 1913.

presiding over the *yonis* he found a remote possibility of 'an allusion to the physical fact of the *liṅga* and *yoni* connected together', but held that no close association of phallism with the cult of Śiva had taken place upto the time of Wema Kadphises on whose coins this emblem was never used as a device, that the *liṅga*-worship had not come into use at the time of Patañjali and that it was in the fourteenth chapter of the Anuśāsanaparva of the *Mahābhārata* that a clear reference to the worship of Śiva phallus was to be found. He was correct in his statement that the Rudra-Śiva cult borrowed several elements from the dwellers in forest and stragglers in places out of the way. He suggested that in the epithet *maheśvara* in coin legends a probable reference to the sectarian name of Pāśupata-Māheśvara was found. He was inclined to place the rise of the Pāśupata school mentioned in the *Nārāyaṇīya* about the second century BC. He utilised Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* in his summary presentation of the Pāśupata system. He tried to prove on the basis of a number of a medieval inscriptions the two extremist Śaiva schools of Kāpālika and Kālāmukha were known as the branches of the Lākuliśa-Pāśupata sect. He pointed out tribal origins of certain Śākta goddesses and gave summary of the two Durgā hymns of the *Mahābhārata* and, after carefully scanning them, picked out the various strands in the composition of this form of Śakti worship. The cults of Rāma, Gaṇapati, Skanda-Kārttikeya, etc. were dealt with for the first time on the basis of all available evidences by him. According to him the exclusive worship of Gaṇeśa did not originate even in the Gupta period. "In his own nature this last god is an unfriendly or malignant spirit, but capable of being made friendly and benignant by propitiatory rites, resembling his father Rudra in this respect."

II

The Supreme Being of any sectarian religion was expected to be approached only through *bhakti*. Though the term *bhakti* meant 'devotion', it has a special significance when it was used in religious sense. While dealing with the *Bhagavadgītā* and the epico-Puranic religion we have already had the occasion to deal with the concept of *bhakti*. Much about the concept was discussed in the preceding chapter also. In the beginning of the present chapter we have seen how Weber and Lorinser emphasised on the *bhakti* theme mainly to point out the similarities between Kṛṣṇa-worship and Christian-

ity and how Monier-Williams insisted on the idea that the religion of *bhakti* was a theistic expression of Hinduism comparable with Christian theism. Western writers of the earlier generation were in a search of a Hindu pattern that would fit the Christian definition of monotheism, and Vaiṣṇavism was accepted as a Hindu archetype of monotheism. Grierson went a step further and described *bhakti* as a monotheistic school which originated from the teachings of the *Bhagavadgītā* in contradistinction to the pantheistic Brahmanism and the Advaita Vedantist doctrine of salvation. He held that "only the followers of this religion, the Bhāgavatas, has a correct understanding of the monotheos" and that the Vedānta was nothing more than a "belief in a passionless, impersonal, supreme deity unmoved by prayer and adoration". He reconstructed a systematic account of the *bhakti* religion from the ancient to the medieval period of Indian history, showing the presence of *bhakti* in Classical literature and tracing the process through which the Bhāgavata or Vaiṣṇava religion had formalised a theology of its own. He also added a new dimension by correlating with them the literary works and views of the medieval saint poets of northern India.[16]

Among the Indian scholars, Sir R.G. Bhandarkar held that the Abhir tribes might have brought into India some legends relating to Jesus Christ, but he was not ready to subscribe to the myth created by Weber and others that the idea of the *bhakti* in Vaiṣṇavism was due to Christian influence or any extraneous cause. As we have shown above, he proved, with the considerable success that Vaiṣṇavism, Kṛṣṇa cult and *bhakti* concept came into existence in India long before the advent of Jesus Christ. The Ghosundi and Nanaghat inscriptions, the *garuḍadhvaja* column of Besnagar, the *Indika* reference to the worship of Vāsudeva Kṛṣṇa, the testimony of Pāṇini and other evidences proved beyond doubt the pre-Christian origin of Vaiṣṇavism. He constructed the history of the Bhakti religion by producing its earliest evidence in the Ekāntika-dharma mentioned in the Nārāyaṇīya section of the *Mahābhārata*. He traced its history from the fifth century BC to the middle of the

[16]G.A. Grierson, *The Modern Vernacular Literature of Hinduism*, Calcutta, 1899; 'The Nārāyaṇīya and the Bhāgavatas', rep. from *Ind. Ant.*, Bombay, 1909; 'Modern Hinduism and Its Debt to the Nestorians' in *Yearbook of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1907; 'The Monotheistic Religion of Ancient India and Its Descendant, the Modern Doctrine of Faith', paper presented at the *Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, Oxford, 1908.

seventeenth century AD. His historical account of Vaiṣṇavism included within its purview the Āḻvār tradition of South India and the medieval Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas of the northern and southern India. He had also referred to the ideological conflict which the Vaiṣṇava theoreticians had to make while facing the hostility of spiritual monism, i.e. Advaita Vedānta. This question requires a separate discussion. Bhandarkar, while dealing with the doctrine of *bhakti* repudiated the hypothesis of the Christian influence on it, but so far as the concept of *bhakti* was concerned, he equated *bhakti* with Vaiṣṇavism and Vaiṣṇavism with monotheism and followed the standardised definition of *bhakti* suggested by the Western scholars.

From a purely Indian viewpoint the *bhakti* concept was evaluated and explained by B.K. Goswami who delivered a series of lectures on *bhakti* in the Calcutta University (1919–21) which were published in a book form in 1922.[17] He held that most philosophical systems of India started with the search for the immortal aspect behind and beyond mortal life and *bhakti* was a means to achieve this, which comprised a lot of heterogeneous elements. These elements were interconnected, though different schools of thought laid greater emphasis on their chosen elements. The idea that *bhakti* was based on a loving devotion to a personal monotheistic god was an oversimplified concept when viewed against the backdrop of the entire Indian tradition. He began with the Vedas which, he said contained the earliest phase of the cult of *bhakti* in its manifold form and supplemented his thesis with the later Vedic enquiries into the spiritual nature of man. He held that in the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga, and in a lesser degree in Buddhism and Jainism, heresy and orthodoxy met on the common platform of self-contemplation. The Smārta way of life and the Vedānta brought two different dimensions which were synthesised in the second phase of the *bhakti* cult. The third phase was characterised by the rise of the Sātvata or Bhāgavata schools, Pāśupatas and the Vaiṣṇava yogas, and *bhakti* as a personal devotion found another expression through the Itihāsas, Purāṇas and Āgamas which proclaimed the doctrine of comprehensive and composite devotion. The next development was characterised by him as Śuddha-Bhakti which found highest expression in Vaiṣṇavism. *Bhakti* according to the author, should be used as a key to explore 'the essential attributes of Viṣṇu,

[17] *The Bhakti Cult in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1922.

the element of *māyā* and its jurisdiction, individual souls and the universal soul, other religious cults, possibility of a divine life and the inspiration, initiation and guidance of real life. It is an all-round life-impression, active life in its comprehensiveness integrating the rational and emotional aspects. The work was based on the authors own interpretation of the sacred texts from which copious illustrations were suggested for convincing the readers.

Semantic study of *bhakti* was made by Hopkins (1911) in connection with the epic use of the concepts of *bhakti* and *bhāgavata*.[18] M. Dasgupta (1930) tried to trace the Vedic roots of *bhakti* in connection with the parallel concept of *śraddhā*.[19] J. Gonda (1948) had adopted a much wider scale and included the writings of the medieval Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas in his study.[20] All of them agreed that the word *bhakti* was not used in the classical texts in its present technical meaning, though none of them rejected the existing, but one-sided, interpretation that *bhakti* implied the loving devotion to a personal God coupled with the constant awareness of the fundamental difference between God and man. According to M.R. Sharma (1958),[21] the elements of *bhakti* were found in the Vedas, the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads. He equated *prapatti* with *bhakti* and held that all the six constituents of *prapatti*, as enumerated in the *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā* and the *Lakṣmītantra*—to do what is correct, to avoid sin, to have faith in the Lord, to have faith in His protection, to approach him with humility and to surrender completely to His will—were found also in the Vedic hymns. According to P.V. Kane (1962),[22] the word *prapadye* used in the *Śvetāśvatara* served as the basis of the doctrine of *prapatti* in later Vaiṣṇavite *bhakti* system. *Prapatti* or absolute self-surrender to God was distinguished from *bhakti* in the works of Rāmānuja and of other Vaiṣṇava schools but the *Gītā* made no such distinction explicitly. A. Gail in his *Bhakti im Bhagāvatapurāṇa* (1969)[23] also held that *bhakti* implied the notion of a personal relationship between God and man.

[18] *JRAS*, 1911, 727–38.

[19] *IHQ*, 1930, 315–33, 487–513.

[20] 'Het Begrip Bhakti' in *Tijschriftvoor Philosophie*, Utrecht, 1948.

[21] *Bhakti kā Vikāsa*, Varanasi, 1958, 149–54.

[22] *History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. V, Poona, 1962, 950–80.

[23] *Münchener Indologische Studien*, vol. VI.

From a Marxist point of view D.D. Kosambi (1965)[24] tried to establish a link between *bhakti* and feudalism; the loyalty to God he viewed in terms of the loyalty to the master or the feudal lord. According to him, the doctrine of *bhakti* which was nothing but 'unflinching loyalty, suited the feudal ideology perfectly.[25] Suvira Jaiswal[26] held that the terms *bhagavat, bhakti* and *bhakta* were inextricably related with each other; *bhagavat* originally denoted primitive tribal group which owned all tribal wealth; *bhakti* meant a share thereof; and *bhakta*, an individual to receive such a share. In course of time *bhagavat* came to be regarded as a god and *bhakta*, who was a member of the tribe, came to be looked upon as belonging to him and as his devotee in a feudalistic chainwork. She thought that the *Gītā* sought to emphasise the relationship of the master and the slave between the deity and devotee because after the break up of tribal solidarity the society was getting reorganised on the basis of *varṇa* division for the success of which a religion based on devotion was required. R.S. Sharma (1974)[27] accepted Kosambi's theory in its entirety and held that *bhakti* "reflected a complete dependence of the tenants or semi-serfs on the landowners in the medieval times". According to him *bhakti* along with feudalism was the precursor of medievalism.

A collection of papers on Bhakti cult was prepared by D.C. Sircar in 1970.[28] In his introductory paper he suggested that "sectarianism of some sort was the characteristic of the religious life of India even before the latest hymns of the *Rgveda* were composed". V.S. Agrawala in his paper had drawn attention to some sort of devotional sectarianism in the Vedic period.[29] According to A.C. Chakravarti, the *RV* knew the existence of some sort of *bhakti* which was proved by the use of the terms *bhakta* and *abhakta*; the word *bhajāmahe* occurring in I.156.3 and meaning 'we worship' was probably used in a devotional sense.[30] Evolution of the concept of

[24] *JESHO*, IV, 198–224, *Cul. and Civ. Anc. Ind.*

[25] Irfan Habib, another Marxist historian, while dealing with the medieval *bhakti* movement (1965), held quite an opposite view. According to him, it was a movement of the lower-caste artisan class aimed at destroying the feudal order, sowing the seeds of class conflict leading to social mobility.

[26] *The Origin and Development of Vaisnavism*, Delhi, 1967.

[27] *Indian Historical Review*, vol. 1, 1974.

[28] *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, Calcutta, 1970.

[29] Ibid., 11 ff. See also his *Prācina Bhāratiya Lokadharma* (in Hindi).

[30] *The Bhakti Cult and Ancient Indian Geography*, 49–66.

bhakti was described by B.V. Ramanujam[31] while the semantic development of the root *bhaj*, from which *bhakti* was derived was traced by S.B. Bhattacharyya.[32] Bhakti cult was subsequently dealt with by R.N. Vyas[33] who made an extensive study on the doctrine of Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Vallabha. He also held that the doctrine of *bhakti* was rooted in the Vedas and that though the term *bhakti* was not found in the earliest principal Upaniṣads yet the doctrine of God's grace was not absent there which could be attained by the person alone whom the Supreme Soul favoured and to whom it disclosed its form.

Susmita Pande (1983)[34] also found *bhakti* elements in the Vedic texts and held that "the presence of elements such as the sense of wonder, justice, grace and helpfulness in the gods, the correlation of grace and faith, repentance, confession, forgiveness of sin, the sense of communion with the deity and his omnipresence and immanence, have surprised scholars who regard the Vedic religion as essentially polytheistic and animistic in character and have led others like Macnicol admit that it is not necessary to suppose that *bhakti* which is essentially associated with a theistic faith always follows an independent line of development of its own, or that it arose in entire independence of the Vedas". She also held that the epics and the *Bhagavadgītā* openly championed the cause of *bhakti* and in this connection referred to the seventh chapter of the *Gītā* where Kṛṣṇa classified the devotees in four categories—*ārta* (in distress), *jijñāsu* (seekers of knowledge), *arthārthī* (seekers or worldly riches) and *jñānī* (men of wisdom)—and explicitly favoured the *Jñānī-bhaktas* who were even in constant union with the Divine and whose devotion was single-minded (*ekabhakta*) for whom only Vāsudeva was everywhere. She dealt at length with the Vaiṣṇava concept of *śaraṇāgati* which, according to Rāmānuja, implied the transference of *svarūpa* (ownness), *phala* (fruits of deeds) and *bhāra* (responsibility) to God. She emphasised that in Buddhism one could also find the full gamut of emotions and attitude involve in *bhakti-anusmṛti, śaraṇāgati, bhagavānpūjā, nāmasmaraṇa*, etc. She also dealt with the *bhakti*-oriented views of Śāntideva as found expression in his *Bodhicaryāvatāra* and with its culmination

[31] Ibid., 74 ff.

[32] Ibid., 67–73.

[33] *The Bhāgavata Bhakti Cult*, Delhi, 1977.

[34] *Birth of Bhakti in Indian Religions and Art*, Delhi, 1983.

as found in the *Sukhāvativyūha*. The *bhakti* concept of the Āḻvārs of the South and that of the Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas and various other sources of *bhakti* were discussed by her.

Friedhelm Hardy in his *Viraha-Bhakti*[35] held that the theme of the separation of the *gopīs* from Kṛṣṇa and of their pining for his return found expression not only in myth, but also in the devotion and poetry of a religious culture which evolved in South India. From the fifth century AD the Tamils absorbed many elements from the classical traditions of the North, such as yoga, temple worship and Kṛṣṇa myths, and the results were unique blends of the two civilisations. *Viraha-bhakti*, as the author styled this type of Kṛṣṇa religion, imbued the theme of separation with erotic and ecstatic features and evolved as one of the highlights of Indian religion and culture. The present work was detailed study of the multifarious origins of *viraha-bhakti* in South India and its developments upto the point at which it entered the pan-Indian scene. Against the background of *bhakti* religion in the context of the older religious discussion, the ground for this study was prepared in the second part of this volume by exploring the Northern sources of Kṛṣṇa myths, poetry and devotion during the first millennium AD. A chronological and thematic frame of reference was thereby obtained against which the Southern materials could be projected. The third part attempted to piece together a picture of Kṛṣṇa as he was treated in the old Saṅgama literature, while the fourth part contained a full-fledged study of the Āḻvārs with whom *viraha-bhakti* reached its culmination in the south. This part was not only a critical analysis of the highly important Āḻvārs, but also explored the precise relationship between the poetry of the age of *bhakti* and the Saṅgam literature. The fifth part traced the further influence of the Āḻvārs. According to the author the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* was composed in the south, around the ninth century A.D. as an adaptation in Sanskrit of Āḻvār religion. He tried to show the Tamil originals of some best known chapters of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. The subsequent spread of Kṛṣṇa devotion, particularly in the form of *viraha-bhakti* to the whole of India could be traced back to this text. More generally, the study suggested a revision of the monolithic image of Indian religion. It differentiated a great variety of interacting traditions and milieux and demonstrated the

[35] *Viraha-Bhakti: The Early History of the Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India*, Oxford, 1983.

dynamism of Indian culture. By identifying a specific type of religion and reflecting on its significance, the author attempted at the same time, to go beyond purely textual and historical considerations.

The latest work on Bhakti cult was by Krishna Sharma which was a significant departure from some well established notions about *bhakti* and *bhakti* movement.[36] It questioned and rejected the current academic definitions of *bhakti* and the portrayals of the *bhakti* movement in the light of that definition. According to the author what the Western scholars said in regard to *bhakti* was not based on a careful and unbiased probing into Hindu evidence. "On the contrary it was largely determined by their own standards of judgement which carried a Western/Christian bias. The parameters under question relate to the acceptance of a clear division between religion and philosophy, between personal and impersonal concepts of God, and between monism and monotheism. But such demarcations bear no relevance in the context of Hinduism. All theoreticians about *bhakti* with their support were bound to turn faulty. In any case, the Hindus had never taken a restricted view of *bhakti* as a definite religious cult involving a uniform set of ideas or beliefs. Its projection to that effect was therefore, unjustifiable. Nevertheless, explanations of *bhakti* as offered by Western scholars, later got incorporated in Indian scholarship also. This happened in the nineteenth century which marked the beginning of Indian writings of Hinduism along with Western historico-analytical methodology". Trying to recapture the generic meaning, Krishna Sharma therefore postulated that *bhakti* by itself did not suggest any ideational or doctrinaire position. According to her, a restricted and erroneous definition of *bhakti* had served as the substratum for all theoreticians about the *bhakti* movement, when taken as a whole. What was reckoned as the *bhakti* movement, she affirmed, was an amalgam of a number of devotional movements of a divergent nature. A monolithic view of this could be taken only if their common denominator *bhakti* was understood in its generic sense. Not otherwise. Hence she asked: "Can *bhakti* be reckoned as a religious cult and doctrine signifying a set of beliefs and ideas? Is it legitimate to ascribe a common ideology to the whole of what is known as the *bhakti* movement and to all *bhaktas* whose names are associated with it, on grounds of the common denominator *bhakti*

[36] *Bhakti and Bhakti Movement: A New Perspective*, New Delhi, 1987.

and the ideology ascribed to it? Should all the medieval religious movements covered under the *bhakti* movement be traced back to a common source of inspiration? Must they always be linked with the systems of Vedānta provided by Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva and Vallabhācārya? Should the difference between their systems of Vedānta and that of Śaṅkara be interpreted as the difference between *jñāna* and *bhakti*?" The work attempted to answer these questions and offered a new perspective resting on the following postulations: (i) *Bhakti* was neither a cult, nor a doctrine. (ii) It was wrong to equate *bhakti* primarily with Vaiṣṇavism. (iii) Explanation of *bhakti* as a monotheism as opposed to monism was fallacious. (iv) Nirguṇa-*bhakti* had its own rationale. (v) The Juxtaposition of Śaṅkara's Advaita Vedānta and *bhakti*, and that of *bhakti* and *jñāna*, was unwarranted. (vi) The Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas like Rāmānuja, etc. were primarily Vaiṣṇavas and secondarily philosophers. (vii) Their differences with Śaṅkara was concerned with the task of consolidating Vaiṣṇava thought in the language of Vedānta. (viii) It was an error to treat the so-called *bhakti* movement as an integrated phenomenon. (ix) The thought of the Nirguṇa *bhaktas* was more in keeping with that of Śaṅkara than with that of the Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas. (x) The genesis of Nirguṇa-*bhakti* could be fixed in the convergence of the *āstika* and *nāstika* tradition that took place during the early medieval period.[37]

III

So far as the study on Vaiṣṇavism is concerned, besides the works associated with it mentioned in the earlier chapters and also in the preceding section of the present chapter, there are a few others

[37]In connection of the doctrine of *bhakti* the following works may also be cited: R.G. Bhandarkar, 'The Rāmānujīya and the Bhāgavata and Pāñcarātra systems', paper presented in the Seventh International Oriental Congress, 1886, Vienna, 1889; R. Otto, *Christianity and Indian Religion of Grace*, Madras, 1929; S.A. Bhattacharya,'A Study of the Cult of Devotion' in *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Madras, 1961; A.K. Majmudar, *Bhakti Renaissance*, Bombay, 1965; M.K.V. Aiyer, 'Bhakti from Advaita Standpoint' in *Vedānta Kesari*, LII, 1966; A.P. Misra, *The Development and Place of Bhakti in Śaṅkara's Vedānta*, Allahabad, 1967; T.J. Salomon, 'Early Vaisnava Bhakti and Its Autochthonous Heritage' in *History of Religions*, Chicago, 1970; A.J. Appaswamy, *The Theology of Hindu Bhakti*, Madras, 1970; M. Dhavamony, *Love of God according to the Śaiva Siddhānta*, Oxford, 1971; J.C. Plott, *Philosophy of Devotion*, Delhi, 1974; Arvind Sharma, 'The Bhagavadgītā and Later Bhakti Developments' in *M.M. Gopinath Kaviraj Commemoration Volume*, Allahabad, 1976; N.N. Bhattacharyya ed., *Medieval Bhakti Movements in India*, New Delhi, 1989.

which deserve special mention. Among these, F.O. Schrader's (1916) work on the Pāñcarātra texts had been of permanent value to the researchers in this field.[38] According to tradition there were 108 Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās. But we actually have the names of more than 200 texts. Schrader compiled a list of 224 Pāñcarātra texts variously classed as Saṃhitās, Tantras and Āgamas on the basis of the names as found from various texts. He grouped the Pāñcarātra literature under three classes: (1) the original Saṃhitās to which belong most of the extant works; (2) the much smaller South Indian class comprising the legitimate descendants of the first group; and (3) the still smaller class, North and South Indian, of apocryphal on spurious Saṃhitās. He also fixed the tentative order of the texts. The *Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, the most important Pāñcarātra text to which Schrader had drawn our attention, dealt elaborately with the Vyūha doctrine, the thirty-nine *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga, the typical Vaiṣṇava symbols, places fit for *puraścaraṇa*, places sacred to Viṣṇu, linguistic occulticism, procedure of *mahābhiṣeka* and so on. Schrader also suggested that once the term Pāñcarātra like that of the Bhāgavata had a wider denotation since the Pāñcarātra texts were associated with the names of deities like Śiva, Devī, Gaṇeśa, Brahmā, etc., but came finally to be connected with Vaiṣṇavism and became an integral part of it.

R.P. Chanda's study of Vaiṣṇavism (1916, 1920) was very much thought-provoking.[39] He vigorously asserted that the cult of Gopāla or child Kṛṣṇa had nothing to do with any Christian influence. The presence of certain common elements in the legends of child Kṛṣṇa and those of Christ proved nothing: even there was a great deal of resemblance between the career of boy Kṛṣṇa and of young Perseus. The dramatic representation of Kaṃsa-*vadha* referred to in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (on Pāṇini, III.1.26) indicated that these legends were older than Christianity. He denies that the Kaṃsa-*vadha* episode was a nature-myth and argued, quite correctly, on the basis of Haradatta's *Kāśikapadamañjarī*, that the famous passage in the *Mahābhāṣya* did not allude to the Granthikas, who recited the story by dividing themselves into two sections

[38]*Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, Madras, 1916.

[39]'Race and Cult-Vaisnavism' in *Indo-Aryan Races*, Rajshahi, 1916 ed. by the present author, Calcutta, 1969; *Archaeology and Vaiṣṇava Tradition* , MASI, V, Calcutta, 1920.

as supporters of Kaṃsa and Kṛṣṇa respectively, but merely referred to the audience. Chanda's views especially on the question of the relation of the Vyūhas and Avatāras were indeed thought-provoking, and it practically went to his credit to point out the un-Vedic characteristics of Vaiṣṇavism. The second work (1920) was one of the best works on Vaiṣṇavism which began with Chanda's idea of the relation between archaeology and religion and in the subsequent sections dealt with the importance of the Besnagar pillar inscription, the Ghausundi stone-slab and Nanaghat cave inscriptions, the Mora stone-slab inscription and the Mathura inscription of the time of the great Satrap Soḍāsa. The origin and antiquity of orthodox Vaiṣṇavism, the antiquity of the image of Viṣṇu, the reference to Vāsudeva and Arjuna in Pāṇini, the identity of Heracles and Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu, the significance of Makaradhvaja of Besnagar, the Pāñcarātra cult of the Vyūhas, the background of the conversion of Heliodoros into Vaiṣṇava faith, the circumstances leading to the abandonment of the practice of admitting aliens to the Hindu society, and other allied topics were also dealt with in detail.

H.C. Raychaudhuri's four lectures on Vaiṣṇavism were published in a book form by the University of Calcutta on 1920.[40] In his first lecture Raychaudhuri tried to draw a distinction between the worship of Urukrama-Viṣṇu which was as old as the *Ṛgveda* and the *bhakti* religion that was called Vaiṣṇavism. He also tried to show that this *bhakti* religion was not a plagiarism from Christianity, but owed its origin to Vāsudeva. He next tried to prove the correctness of the tradition that the true Vāsudeva was Kṛṣṇa, the famous prince of the Vṛṣṇi line of Mathura. In doing this he had attempted to refute the theories which held (i) that the true Vāsudeva, i.e., the originator of Bhāgavatism, was not the Kṣatriya prince Kṛṣṇa, (ii) that Vāsudeva, though a Kṣatriya prince, was not to be identified with Kṛṣṇa, (iii) that Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa was a solar deity, (iv) that Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa was a tribal god, and (v) that Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa was a vegetation deity. In his second lecture Raychaudhuri had attempted to reconstruct the true history of the life of Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa from such historical data as were available, and had pointed out that he came into contact with Solar worship, and the doctrine which he learnt from a Solar priest were the foundations on which the superstructure of Bhāgavatism was raised. He

[40] *Materials for the Study of the Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Sect*, Calcutta, 1920.

then told the story of the spread of the new faith from its cradle in the valley of the Jumna. He tried to show that the earlier Brahmanical attitude towards the faith was one of hostility, but later on there was a combination between Brahmanism and Bhāgavatism probably owing to the Buddhist propaganda of the Mauryans. As a result of this alliance Vāsudeva was identical with the Brahmanic gods, Nārāyaṇa and Viṣṇu. In the third lecture he had discussed the question of the relation of Bhāgavatism to Ājīvikism, Jainism, Buddhism and Christianity. In the fourth lecture he had traced the fortune of the Bhāgavata religion from the first century AD to the time of Tamil *ācāryas*. He suggested that the Śaka and Kuṣāṇa sovereigns of northern India were generally hostile towards the religion of Vāsudeva and it was this anti-Bhāgavata attitude which probably brought the foreign kings into conflict with the Vaiṣṇava monarchs and the imperial Guptas. The Guptas did for Bhāgavatism what Aśoka had done for Buddhism. With the fall of the Guptas and the coming of the Huṇas Bhāgavatism lost its predominance in northern India but it flourished in the Tamil country and finally Rāmānuja and his followers restored it the position it held under the Guptas.

Whether one might agree or not with the theories of Raychaudhuri, particularly his views on royal patronage or hostility, one special feature which could not be ignored was that Vaiṣṇavism in the course of its development had several turnpoints in different periods of history. It was revitalised by a new-fangled *bhakti* spirit which was injected to it by the Āḻvār saint-poets of the South as well as by a neo-theistic interpretation of Vedānta by the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* from the South like Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva, Vallabha and others, and the renovated forms of Vaiṣṇavism enriched by their efforts permeated the vast region of northern India as well. We have already had the occasion to refer to some works of the Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* of the South, but since these movement belonged mostly to the medieval period, we propose to treat them more elaborately on the second volume of this work.[41] Ancient period of the history of Vaiṣṇavism in South India was, however, dealt with in S.K. Iyangar's

[41] Among the earlier works on South India mention may be made in this connection of A. Govindacharya's *The Divine Wisdom of the Dravida Saints*, Madras, 1902; *Life of Rāmānuja*, Madras, 1906; T. Rajagopalachariar, *The Vaisnavite Reformers of India*, Madras, 1909; S.K. Iyangar, *Early History of Vaisnavism in South India*, London, 1920; T.A.G. Rao, *History of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas*, Madras, 1923, etc.

work (1920) mentioned below. The growing importance of Vāsudevism in South India was indicated by the Chinna inscription of the second century AD which began with an adoration, and a Prākrit charter of the Pallavas referring to a *devakula* of Bhāgavat Nārāyaṇa somewhere in the Guntur district. The introduction of Bhāgavatism in the Far South at a much earlier date was indicated by the relation of the Pāṇḍyas with the Pāṇḍavas and the Surasenas alluded to in the stories narrated by Megasthenes about Heracles and Pandaia and in the grammatical work of Kātyāyana as also by the name of the Pāṇḍya capital Madura (Mathurā). The best evidence of the influence of Vaiṣṇavism in the Far South, especially in the Tamil country, was, however, furnished by the devotional songs of the Āḻvārs. S.K. De's brilliant work on Bengal Vaiṣṇavism[42] dealt exclusively with the medieval period which threw light on the beginnings of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, advent of Caitanya, the six Gosvāmins of Vṛndāvana, devotional sentiments, theology and philosophy, ritualism and devotional practices and literary works, to be discussed in detail in the next volume.

A few important papers on Vaiṣṇavism should be mentioned in this connection. Extracts of Weber's German *Kṛṣṇajanmāṣṭamī* were published in 1874 under the title 'An Investigation into the Origin of the Festival of Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī'.[43] In 1882 M. Monier-Williams published an important paper under the title 'The Vaiṣṇava Religion'.[44] These were followed in 1907–08 by J. Kennedy's 'The Child Kṛṣṇa, Christianity and the Gujars'[45] and 'The Child Kṛṣṇa and His Critics;'[46] V.V. Sovani's (1910) 'The Translation of the Term Bhagavat';[47] Govindacharya Svamin's (1910–11) 'The Translation of the Term Bhagavan'[48] and 'The Pāñcarātra or Bhāgavata Śāstra'.[49] Garbe's *Introduction to the Bhagavadgītā* was rendered into English by N.B. Utgikar in 1918.[50] Likewise M.E. Senart's 'Introduction to the French Translation of the Bhagavadgītā' was published in

[42] *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faiths and Movements in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1942.
[43] *Ind. Ant.*, III, 1874, 21–25, 47–52.
[44] *JRAS*, N.S., XIV, 1882, 289–316.
[45] Ibid., 1907, 951–91.
[46] Ibid., 1908, 505–21.
[47] Ibid., 1910, 863–67.
[48] Ibid., 861–63.
[49] Ibid., 1911, 935–61.
[50] *Ind. Ant.*, 1918, App. 1–33.

1926–27.[51] J. Charpentier's (1927) 'Meaning and Etymology of Pūjā',[52] M. Dasgupta's (1931) 'Early Viṣṇuism and Nārāyaṇīya Worship',[53] S.K. De's (1931) 'A Note on Pañcakalā in connection with Pāñcarātra',[54] D.L. De's (1933) 'Pañcarātra and the Upaniṣads',[55] Otto Rudolf's (1935) 'The God of the Gītā ',[56] W. Ruben's (1941) 'The Puranic Lines of Heroes',[57] L.B. Keny's (1942) 'The Origin of Nārāyaṇa',[58] N.M. Chaudhuri's (1944) 'Some Aspects of the Worship of Nārāyaṇa',[59] S.K. Chatterji's (1950) 'Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and Kṛṣṇa Vāsudeva',[60] V.S. Pathak's (1952) 'Early Vaiṣṇava Pantheon',[61] S.K. De's (1953) 'Bhāgavatism and Sun-Worship',[62] etc. were important contributions to the study of Vaiṣṇavism. Besides reference should be made to J. Przyluski's 'The Name of the God Viṣṇu and the Kṛṣṇa Legend',[63] Sivaramamurti's 'The Weapons of Viṣṇu',[64] K.B. Pahtak's 'Divine Vasudeva different from Kṣatriya Vāsudeva in Patañjali's Opinion',[65] J.N. Banerjea's 'The Worship of Śāmba among the Early Pāñcarātrins',[66] A.K. Majumdar's 'A Note on the Development of the Rādhā Cult',[67] B. Bhattacharyya's 'The Ten Avatāras and their Birth-dates',[68] N. Dandekar's 'Viṣṇu in the Vedas',[69] A.P. Karmarkar's 'The Matsyāvatāra of Viṣṇu',[70] S.L. Katre's 'The Avatāras',[71] etc.

[51] *ABORI*, VIII, 1926–27, 305–21.
[52] *Ind. Ant.*, 1927, 93–99, 130–36.
[53] *IHQ*, VII, 1931, 93–116, 343–58; VIII, 1932, 64–84.
[54] *JRAS*, 1931, 415–18.
[55] *IHQ*, 1933, 645 ff.
[56] *Visvabharati Quarterly*, I, 1935.
[57] *JRAS*, 1941, 247–56, 337–58.
[58] *ABORI*, XXII, 1942, 250–56.
[59] *IHQ*, XX, 1944, 275–84.
[60] *JRASB*, XVI, 1950, 73–87.
[61] *JUPHS*, 1952.
[62] *BSOS*, VI, 669–72; *Our Heritage*, I, 1953, 1 ff.
[63] *Jour. Mythic Soc.*, N.S., XIV.
[64] *Artibus Asiae*, XVIII.
[65] *JBBRAS*, XXIII, 96 ff.
[66] *PIHC*, VII, 82–90.
[67] *ABORI*, XXXVI, 231–57.
[68] *Festschrift Thomas*, 31–33.
[69] *Festschrift Kane*, 95–111.
[70] Ibid., 253 ff.
[71] *Allahabad University Studies*, X, 37–310.

J. Gonda's (1954) celebrated work on Vaiṣṇavism[72] interpreted various aspects of Viṣṇu in terms of his connection with fertility, liberalism and beneficence, sun, Indra, *vajra*, the three strodes, the sacrifice and sacrificial post, relation to other gods, kingship etc. Some speciai aspects of Viṣṇu such as his navel, his sleep, his association with the thumb of the priest in connection with funeral rites, his conception as door-keeper, his abode, the Śālagrāma stone, his association with the some plant and the sap etc. were dealt with. Light was also thrown on the emblems and attributes of Viṣṇu, his various names, his exploits, the *avatāras*, the tortoise and the churning of ocean, the boar, the dwarf, the animals, Kṛṣṇa etc. as well as on the myth of Viṣṇu, the sun, and Indra. A special chapter was devoted to Śrī and Viṣṇu's female partners and another to the Vaikhānasa Viṣṇu rites. This work primarily aimed at presenting a supplement to the literature on the subject now in existence by laying emphasis on a few points, the importance of which would appear to have escaped others and by drawing attention to some aspects of early Viṣṇuism which seemed to have been neglected by most scholars in this particular field. With regard to the much-discussed problem of the so-called origin of the Viṣṇu conception, Gonda was inclined to assume that there was much truth in the time-honoured Indian interpretation of Viṣṇu's character as representing pervasiveness and spatial extensiveness, and especially that pervasiveness and omnipresence which was essential to the establishment and maintenance of the cosmos and beneficial to the interests of gods and men. At the same time he hesitated to emphasise that the general idea originally underlying the Viṣṇu mythology was the phenomenon of the mighty and blessing stream of celestial light, but attached more value to Viṣṇu's relation with the cosmic axis and to textual evidence pointing to pervasiveness as such which was believed to manifest itself in a great variety of phenomena. But his complete disregard to chronological considerations made him attribute to Viṣṇu features which he acquired much late only through amalgamation with various divinities. He also made no attempt to distangle the personalities of Nārāyaṇa and Viṣṇu and treated the evidence of Vedic literature and of the epics and Purāṇas in the same vein without paying any attention to the fact that Viṣṇu's character was qualitatively transformed in the epico-Puranic stage.

[72] *Aspects of Early Viṣṇuism*, Utrecht, 1954.

K.G. Goswami (1956) made a historical study of Vaiṣṇavism from the advent of the Śuṅgas to the fall of the Guptas in the light of epigraphic, numismatic and other archaeological materials.[73] An attempt was made in this work to give a picture as to how a tribal cult, which had an humble beginning at Mathura and adjoining places, had become a powerful all-Indian religion and how in course of time its geographical boundary had become more and more extensive. It has also been noticed how Vaiṣṇavism invaded the frontiers of other rival religions and pushed them aside to carve out a wider field for itself. S.C. Mukherjee's (1966) work[74] incorporated his researches in Bengal Vaiṣṇavism down to the end of the medieval period. The first five chapters were devoted to the study of Vaiṣṇavism in pre-Caitanya period discussing the history of Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa worship in ancient India with particular references to Bengal during the Gupta, Pāla and Sena period, the impact of Jayadeva and the pre-Caitanya phenomena. The sixth and last chapter dealt with the life of Caitanya. There were two appendices, the first on the Rādhā cult and the second on iconography. Another important publication of 1966 was M. Singer's *Kṛṣṇa: Myths, Rites and Attitudes*.

Suvira Jaiswal's thought-provoking historical work on Vaiṣṇavism[75] which dealt with the period from *c.* 200 BC to AD 500, made a full use of the available literary and archaeological sources, analysed the origin and evolution of the Vaiṣṇava pantheon from an anthropological point of view and tried to discover its material basis. It sought to explode the superstructure of myths and intellectual fantasies enveloping the cult of Pāñcarātra and explored the mystery of its association with Nārāyaṇa. The doctrine of incarnation was subjected to a critical analysis and the adoption of Rāma and Buddha as incarnations of Viṣṇu was examined afresh. Vaiṣṇavite goddesses such as Śrī Lakṣmī, Ekānaṃśā and Sītā received special treatment. The work postulated interesting hypothesis regarding the changing character of *bhakti* in the context of changes in the social conditions of the times. Elsewhere in this work we have already had the occasion to refer to the view of the author, as revealed in this book, on the changing concept of *bhakti* in accordance with the changes from the tribal to the feudalistic

[73] *A Study of Vaiṣṇavism*, Calcutta, 1956.

[74] *A Study of Vaiṣṇavism in Ancient and Medieval Bengal*, Calcutta, 1966.

[75] *The Origin and Development of Vaiṣṇavism*, New Delhi, 1967.

order of society. Note was also taken of the role of Vaiṣṇavism in stabilising the social order of the day and reconciling the masses to their lot, and an attempt was made to present a detailed picture of the gradual expansion of Vaiṣṇavism throughout the Indian subcontinent. The book also explained the non-Aryan background of the *pūjā* and other Vaiṣṇavite rituals, as well as of festivals. Some other important works bearing on the history and doctrine of Vaiṣṇavism published in the seventies and eighties have been mentioned earlier.

We have also previously had the occasion to refer to some works pertaining to regional Vaiṣṇavism, particularly of southern India. The development of regional Vaiṣṇavism, as we have remarked earlier, was essentially a medieval phenomenon, and as such works on this aspect should be dealt within the next volume, especially the works on the Rāmānuja, Nimbārka, Madhva, Vallabha and Caitanya schools, which we propose to do. But for the sake of showing the continuity and process of historical development some works on these development have already been cited, since in all cases it is not possible to maintain a hard and fast line of demarcation. On Bengal Vaiṣṇavism we have referred to the works of S.K. De and S.C. Mukherjee. Pranabananda Jash's *History and Evolution of Vaiṣṇavism in Eastern India* (Calcutta, 1982) emphasised on certain special aspects of eastern Vaiṣṇavism such as Gopāla-Kṛṣṇa, Rādhāmādhava, Lakṣmī-Nārāyaṇa etc. and dealt with various subjects along with the eastern concept of Avatāravāda, substantiated by available materials, literary and archaeological, upto the time of Jayadeva. As early as in 1940, Prabhat Mukherjee published his *History of Medieval Vaiṣṇavism in Orissa* which dealt with the early history of Jagannātha, Vaiṣṇavism under the Gaṅga kings and under Kapilendra and Puruṣottama, religious condition of Orissa in the pre-Caitanya age, the concept of Rādhā, the Buddhist element, Vaiṣṇava writers of Orissa, philosophical aspects, advent of Caitanyaism and its effects, difference between Gauḍīya and Orissan Vaiṣṇavism and kindred topics. C.R. Das's *Medieval Religion and Literature of Orissa* (Santiniketan, 1952) gave a brief but systematic account of the Vaiṣṇava literature of Orissa. K.C. Misra's *The Cult of Jagannātha* (Calcutta, 1971) was a valuable survey of the origin and development of the cult of Jagannātha in historical outline showing how a tribal god in the course of his chequered history has absorbed elements from Buddhism, Śaivism, Śāktism and other religious ideas

and eventually emerged as the national god of Orissa with a pronounced Vaiṣṇavite bias. But the most important recent work was *The Cult of Jagannātha and the Regional Tradition of Orissa* (New Delhi, 1978) edited by A. Eschmann, H. Kulke and G.C. Tripathi. It dealt with a comparatively less studied aspect of Indian Culture, namely, the role and significance of regional Hindu traditions that emerged in the beginning of the early medieval period out of an interaction of elements of Classical Hinduism with autochthonous local religious practices and beliefs. It was these regional traditions which finally imparted a local colour to the Hinduism of different geographical units. Among the regional traditions the cult of Jagannātha in Orissa was the most interesting because of its archaic character as well as uninterrupted development. The work contained 25 articles by eminent scholars who worked in an interdisciplinary project sponsored by the South Asia Institute of the Heidelberg University during 1970–75. The articles treated various topics pertaining to the Jagannātha cult and the Hindu tradition of Orissa in a coherent and mutually connected manner. The tribal religion of Orissa and the process of Hinduisation of its deities, the origin and development of the trinity of Jagannātha, the importance of the Jagannātha cult for the monarchs and the political history of Orissa, the priests and the Brāhmaṇas connected with the temple—these were some of the major fields which contained interesting information and stimulating ideas. Vaiṣṇavism of Assam was also treated by a number of scholars. In this connection mention may be made of M. Neog's *Śaṅkaradeva and His Times* (Gauhati, 1965) which was subsequently re-issued, with additions, under the title *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Assam* (New Delhi, 1984) and S.N. Sarma's *Neo-Vaiṣṇavite Movement and the Satra Institution of Assam* (Gauhati, 1966). As in the South after Rāmānuja under other celebrated Vaiṣṇava *ācāryas* various schools and sects of Vaiṣṇavism came into existence, so in Assam also, after Śaṅkaradeva under Mādhavadeva, Dāmodaradeva, Gopāl Ātā, Aniruddhadeva and other diverse schools and sects of Vaiṣṇavism flourished. The *satra* institution, meant for local cultural assemblages of the Vaiṣṇavas was a unique feature of Assam Vaiṣṇavism. In these, besides religious discussions, *kīrtana* songs, dramatic performances of Puranic legends, devotional dances, etc. were held. For the *satras*, besides the book of S.N. Sarma, one under the title *Sattrīya Dances and their Rhythms* (ed. M. Neog, Gauhati, 1973) was important.

Among other recent works on Vaiṣṇavism two books on Kṛṣṇa, both published from New Delhi in 1984, should deserve special mention. The first was Noel Seth's *The Divinity of Kṛṣṇa* and the second was B. Preciado-Solis's *The Kṛṣṇa Cycles in the Purāṇas*. We have previously had the occasion to refer to a good number of works on Kṛṣṇa and these works are recent additions to the Kṛṣṇa literature. The latter work recalled that of M. Singer's book mentioned above. Urmila Bhagowalia's *Vaiṣṇavism and Society in Northern India* (New Delhi, 1980) outlined the role of Vaiṣṇavism in social integration during the period between AD 700 and 1200 and surveyed the development of the cult from a ritualistic intellectual religion to a popular theistic cult. The personal attributes of God, the concept of Vyūha, the theory of incarnation, image worship, the cult of Rādhā, *dāna, vratas*, festivals, etc., the role of the Gupta kings in giving land grants to Vaiṣṇava shrines and *agrahāras*, the evolution of social pattern under the impact of Vaiṣṇavism, settlements, temples and images, the position of the Vaiṣṇava cult vis-à-vis other creeds, etc. were discussed along with two appendices on 'Vaiṣṇavism in the South' and 'Distribution of Vaiṣṇava patronage in Northern India'. R.K. Siddhantasastri's *Vaisnavism through the Ages* (New Delhi, 1985) was an historical treatment of the subject in which the author tried to reconstruct an uninterrupted stream of thought flowing from the Vedic period. According to him the smaller streams that were branched out from the main were not different in essence from the original. Another important publication was D.P. Sheridan's *The Advaitic Theism of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (New Delhi, 1986). The importance of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in the shaping of the devotional doctrine of later Vaiṣṇavism is well known, since all the medieval teachers based their theology on this work. Likewise, the theistic interpretation of Vedānta, especially made by the southern Ācāryas—all of whom had their commentaries on the *Vedānta Sūtras* which led to the development of various theories from qualified monism to pure dualism—provided the substratum of the doctrinal aspects of later Vaiṣṇavism. As such a work bridging the practical manual and the theoretical infrastructure was essentially needed, and the work of Sheridan was a laudable attempt in this direction.

IV

The non-Vedic and tribal background of Śiva (which was subsequently attested by the Harappan findings) was recognised by

the earlier scholars like Wurm, Hopkins, Oppert and others, though the general conscientious was that under more than one local Śiva lay concealed an old aboriginal worship, but these substitutions were not affected by the genuine conception of the god. As early as in 1876, F. Kittel[76] wrote on the origin of the phallic worship in India and this aspect of Śaivism was subsequently studied with varying interpretations by a host of scholars. It is interesting to note that even one hundred years after the publication of Kittel's work the academic importance of the phallic cult was not diminished.[77] Apart from the phallic cult which proved to be a substantial element of Śaivism, various other characteristics of Śiva, such as his agricultural origins,[78] commonness with extra-Indian deities like Dionysus (as was detected by Megasthenes in antiquity, and was later stressed by Lassen, though contested by Weber)[79] were discussed. The principal fields of studies in Śaivism were the Vedic concept of Rudra-Śiva,[80] references to Śiva in post-Vedic literary works and inscriptions, the Pāśupata sect, its doctrines, practices and offshoots, various Śiva legends found in the Purāṇas, images and iconography, regional varieties based on new philosophical orientations like the Śaiva Siddhānta, Vīraśaivism, Kashmir Śaivism, etc.

The study of the Pāśupata system was initiated by A.E. Gough in 1882 by his translation of the 'Lakulīśa-Pāśupata Darśana' chapter of Madhava's *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha*. Its historical basis was established by G. Bühler in 1888 through his publication of the *Cintra Praśasti* of the reign of Śārṅgadeva[81] a thirteenth century record

[76] *Uber der Ursprung des Lingakultus in Indien*, Mangalore, 1876.

[77] A recent and comprehensive work on this subject is B. Bhattacharyya's *Śaivism and the Phallic World*, New Delhi, 1975, revised edition, 1993. Some important articles on phallic worship are B.C. Majumdar's 'Phallus Worship in the Mahābhārata' in *JRAS*, XXVII, 1907, 337 ff. J.N. Banerjea's 'Phallic Emblem in Early and Medieval India' in *JISOA*, III; A.P. Karmarkari's 'The Liṅga Cult in Ancient India' in *B.C. Law Vol.*, Calcutta, 1945; A.R.G. Tiwari's 'Śivalingam and Phallus Worship in the Indus Valley Civilization' in *Jour. Śrī Venkat. Or. Inst.*, XIV, 1953; Sankarananda's *Is Śivalinga a Phallus?* Calcutta, 1957; etc.

[78] Cf. N.M. Chaudhuri in *IHQ*, XV, 1939, 183–96.

[79] Cf. W. Kirfel in *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*, LXXVIII, 1953, 83–90.

[80] J. Charpentier, 'Über Rudra Śiva' in *Weiner Zeitschrift*, XXIII, 1909, 151–79; E. Arbmann, *Rudra: Untersuchungen Zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus*, Upsala, 1922; N. Venkataramanayya, *Rudra Śiva*, Madras, 1941.

[81] *Ep. Ind.*, I, 271–87.

from Somnath in Gujarat which stated how Śiva came to Lāṭa and dwelt at Karohana as Lakulīśa. Fresh epigraphical evidence was subsequently suggested by D.R. Bhandarkar in 1904–07 who in his papers 'An Eklingji Stone Inscription and the Origin and History of the Lakulīśa Sect'[82] and 'Lakulīśa'[83] first noted the Puranic data on Lakulīśa in terms of inscriptional material and enabled scholars to establish his date and also to get acquainted with his iconic form.[84] Fleet originally identified Lakulīśa with the Kālāmukha priest Lakulīśvara-paṇḍita[85] but later in 1907 abandoned this opinion in the light of the discoveries of D.R. Bhandarkar.[86] He found a striking similarity between the names of Lakulīśa and Hercules, a point of interest which was subsequently studied by Ingalls as will be seen later. It was Sir R.G. Bhandarkar who first presented in 1913, a systematic exposition of the history and doctrines of the Pāśupatas and dated the rise of the Pāśupata system mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, and presumably Lakulīśa as well about a century after the rise of the Pāñcarātra system, i.e. about the second century BC. In 1920, C.D. Dalal published a Pāśupata text entitled *Gaṇakārikā* with the Ratnaṭīkā commentary attributed to Bhāsarvajña. In 1940 R. Ananthakrishna Sastri published the newly discovered *Pāśupatasūtra* with Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya*.[87]

Since 1940 scholars attempted to re-evaluate the Pāśupata system in the light of new evidence. Among them mention should be made of H.D. Sankalia,[88] K.K. Handiqui,[89] T.V. Mahalingam,[90] H.K. Narasimhaswami,[91] and A.P. Karmarkar.[92] Thought-provoking

[82] *JBBRAS*, XII, 1904–07, 151–65.

[83] *ASIAR*, 1906–07, 179–92.

[84] See also his 'Some published Inscriptions Reconsidered' in *Ind. Ant.*, XXXII, 1913, 57–64 and 'Mathura Pillar Inscription of Candra Gupta II' in *Ep. Ind.*, XXI, 1931–32, 1–9 in which he shed new light on some Pāśupata teachers.

[85] *Ep. Ind.*, VI, 228.

[86] *JRAS*, 1907, 419–26.

[87] *TSS*, 143, Trivandrum, 1940; see also variant readings of several Sūtras ed. by C. Chakravarti in *IHQ*, XIX, 270 ff.; trans. H.P. Chakravarti, Santiniketan, 1970.

[88] *The Archaeology of Gujarat*, Bombay, 1941.

[89] *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1949.

[90] 'The Pāśupatas in South India' in *JIH*, XXVII, 1949, 43–53; See also his 'A Family of Pāśupata Gṛhasthas at Jambukeśvaram' in *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, XXV, 1957, 79–85.

[91] *Ep. Ind.*, XXVII, 268–76; XXXIII, 78–81.

[92] *The Vrātya or Dravidian Systems*, Lonavla, 1950.

discussions on the early history of the Pāśupatas were those by J.N. Banerjea. His studies on the Pāśupata system began in 1951 with his article 'Lakulīśa: The Founder and Systematiser of the Pāśupata Order'[93] and were continued in a wider scale in his subsequent works.[94] Following R.G. Bhandarkar, Banerjea suggested that the Śiva-bhāgavatas mentioned by Patañjali were pre-Lakulīśa Pāśupatas. According to him Lakulīśa was the systematiser of the earlier Pāśupata order. Among other important works bearing on the Pāśupata system mention may be made of R.N. Mehta's 'Karvan: The Seat of the Lakulīśa Sect' (1951),[95] B.P. Majmudar's 'Lakulīśa Pāśupatas and Their Temples in Medieval India' (1953)[96] and P.C. Divanji's 'Lakulīśa of Karvan and his Pāśupata Culture' (1955).[97] A general survey of the philosophical contents of the Pāśupata system indicating its intricacies was made by K.C. Pande in the third volume of his *Bhāskari* (1954) and by S.N. Dasgupta in the fifth volume of his *magnum opus* (1955). A significant contribution to the doctrinal aspects of Pāśupatism based on commentarial studies was made in 1958 by F.A. Schultz.[98] In the same year M. Hara also published a critical translation of Mādhava's chapter on the Lakulīśa-Pāśupata-Darśana.[99] Hara also made a review of Schultz's aforesaid work[100] in 1960 and made valuable textual studies on the Pāśupatas under the title *Pāśupata Kenkyu*, I and II (1964).[101]

V.S. Pathak (1960) tried to prove that a historical person named Śrīkaṇṭha was the founder of the Pāśupata order.[102] S. Chattopadhyaya (1962) following the line of Bhandarkar and Banerjea had given a summary account of the Pāśupatas under the titles

[93] *PIHC*, XIV, 1951, 32–36.

[94] *Development of Hindu Iconography*, Calcutta, 1956; *Comprehensive History of India*, II, 1957, ed. by K.A. Nilakanta Sastri; *Pauranic and Tantric Religion*, Calcutta, 1966.

[95] *PIHC*, XIV, 1951, 71–76; cf. His paper in *JOI*, Baroda, VII, 1957, 169 ff.

[96] *JBRS*, XXXIV, 1953, 1–9.

[97] *Journal of the Gujarat Research Society*, XVII, 1955, 267–74.

[98] *Die Philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata-Systems nach dem Pañcārthabhāṣya und der Ratnaṭīkā*, Walldorf-Hessen, 1958.

[99] *Indo-Iranian Journal*, II, 1958, 8–32.

[100] Ibid., IV, 1960, 165–70.

[101] *Journal of the Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Tokyo, XII, 1964, 57–73; *Hikata Hakushi Koki Kinen ronbunshu*, Fukuoka, 1964, 65–80.

[102] *HSCNI*, Varanasi, 1960; cf. *infra*.

'Lakulīśa and His Time', 'The Lakulīśa Pāśupatas' and 'The Pāśupatas and some Minor Subsects'.[103] Daniel H. Ingalls in his 'Cynics and the Pāśupatas: The Seeking of Dishonour' (1962)[104] tried to show that the name Lakulīśa was derived both semantically and phonetically from Hercules, the patron-saint of cynicism, another man-god who wielded a famous club and that the Indian god ancient Greek writers called Hercules might be Śiva and not Kṛṣṇa. But notwithstanding the similarities in the cult practices of the Pāśupatas and the Cynics and the resemblances between Lakulīśa and Hercules, Ingalls was forced, to 'doubt that the evidence permits one to speak of a genetic relation'. In 1965 R.C. Agrawala drew our attention to some variant sculptural poses of Lakulīśa who was generally depicted as seated in *padmāsana*, with his penis erect, and with a citron in his right hand and a club in his left.[105] A detailed review of the studies on the Pāśupata system was made by David M. Lorenzen in 1972.[106]

The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, said to be the offshoots of the Pāśupata system drew the attention of many scholars, but not much work was done on them. One of the earliest discussions on them was made by R.G. Bhandarkar who limited himself to a brief summary of their accounts as found in the works of Bhavabhūti, Rāmānuja, Ānandagiri and Mādhavācārya. Bhandarkar admitted that there was a confusion as regards the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas in Rāmānuja's account. He considered the Kālāmukhas as a 'most extreme sect'. Between 1886 and 1904 B.L. Rice brought out many inscriptions bearing on the history and doctrine of the Kālāmukhas. Fleet's edition and translation of the inscriptions from Ablur (1898–99)[107] and A.V. Subbhiah's 'A Twelfth Century University in Mysore' (1917)[108] were important contributions of Kālāmukha studies. K.K. Handiqui in his work on Yaśastilaka (1949)[109] and also in a note on Somasiddhānta in his translation of Śrīharṣa's *Naiṣadhacarita* threw important light on the Kāpālikas.

[103] *Evolution of Theistic Sects*, Calcutta, 1962.

[104] *Harvard Theological Review*, LV, 1962, 281–88.

[105] 'Two Standing Lakulīśa Sculptures from Rajasthan', *JOI*, Baroda, XIV, 1965, 388–91.

[106] Cf. *infra*.

[107] *Ep. Ind.*, V, 213–65.

[108] *QJMS*, VII, 157–96.

[109] *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, Sholapur, 1949.

But it went to the credit of David N. Lorenzen to make a systematic and comprehensive study of the Kāpālikas and the Kālāmukhas with reference to all possible sources.[110] He began with the four Śaivite sects mentioned with variants in the *Brahmasūtra* commentaries as well as in the Purāṇas and other sources and then proceeded with the history of the Kāpālikas reconstructed under the following topics: Early sources, Kāpālika Epigraphy, Śaṅkarācārya and the Kāpālikas, Śaṅkara and Ugra Bhairava, Śaṅkara and Krakaca, Śaṅkara and Unmata-Bhairava, Kāpālikas in Sanskrit Drama and Miscellaneous Later Sources. The Kāpālika cult and doctrine were studied under the titles: The Mahāvrata, Somasiddhānta and Kāpālika *bhakti*. The Kālāmukhas of the Śakti Pariṣad and other Kālāmukha priesthoods were dealt with under the following categories: Preliminary, the Mūvara-Koṇeya-samatati; other divisions of the Parvatāvalī; the Bhujaṅgāvalī; the Siṃha Pariṣad; inscriptions from Shimoga, Belgaum, Bellary, Bijapur, Dharwar, Kadur, Chitaldurg, Hassan, Kolar and Tumkur district; the Kriyāśaktis of Vijayanagar; Andhra Pradesh and Madras; Kālāmukhas and Vīraśaivas. The last chapter contained an elaborate treatment of Lakulīśa and the Pāśupatas. Further study on the Pāśupatas, Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas was made by Pranabananda Jash (1974)[111] who also threw new light on the Mattamayūra sect of Śaivism which flourished mostly in Central India. Although many scholars made occasional observations on the Mattamayūras[112] details about them were suggested in V.V. Mirashi's introduction to *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, vol. IV.

In South India Śaivism received a new dimension owing to the influence of the saint-poets, known as the Nāyanārs, 63 in number, whose lives were described in the *Pariya-purāṇam*. Their songs were dealt with by J.N. Farquhar,[113] who had rather unjustly grouped together all the southern schools of Śaivism under the title Āgamic Śaivism and made an oversimplified distinction between the Sanskrit and the Tamil schools saying that "the Sanskrit school has in main a following of the Brāhmaṇas, many of them being temple ministrants; its Vedāntic standpoint is Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda and its literature is in Sanskrit; while the following of the Tamil school is

[110] *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*, New Delhi, 1972.

[111] *History of Śaivism*, Calcutta, 1978.

[112] Cf. H. Goetz in *Arts Asiatiques*, tome V, 1958, 35 ff.

[113] *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, London, 1920.

almost entirely non-Brāhmaṇa; its Vedāntic standpoint is Advaita, or according to the other writer Bhedābheda". P. Kingsbury and G.E. Phillips's *Hymns of the Tamil Saivite Saints* (Calcutta, 1921) was epoch-making, notwithstanding weak translation, in the field of southern Śaiva studies, because it was able to reveal the spirit of the Tamil Śaiva saint-poets to people not conversant with Tamil language. The subsequent works of S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar,[114] K.R. Subramanian,[115] K. Sivapadasundaram,[116] C.V. Narayana Iyer,[117] V.R.R. Dikshitar,[118] M. Katisesu,[119] S.N. Dasgupta,[120] M.A. Dorai Rangaswamy,[121] K.A. Nilakanta Sastri,[122] J.N. Sinha,[123] etc. were able to set the study of Śaivism in general and southern Śaivism in particular, on a more solid platform. On the devotional tradition established by the saint-poets like Appar, Sambandhar, Manikyavacakar, Sundarar, etc. was later developed a religio-philosophical complex with Śiva as the first cause through the efforts of Myekaṇḍadeva (13th century) and his followers. This was known as the Śaiva Siddhānta which attempted to explain the evolution of the world in terms of 36 principles and believed in absolute devotion to be achieved through *caryā, kriyā, yoga* and *jñāna*. The Śaiva Siddhānta had a Tantric branch, known as Āgamanta Śaivism which derived some of its impulses from the earliest Pāśupatas. The Śaiva Siddhānta was studied in detail in most of the works dealing with the Indian philosophical systems, especially its cosmogonical system and its association with the schools of alchemy later popularised by the Siddhas belonging to the Lokāyata or grass-root tradition. Among the specialised treatises on the Śaiva Siddhānta a pioneering work was done in 1911 by J.M. Nallaswami Pillai.[124] The contents of the texts like *Śivajñānabodham, Śivaprakāśam*, etc. were

[114] *Contribution of South India to Indian Culture*, Calcutta, 1923.

[115] *Origin of Śaivism and Its History in Tamil Land*, Madras, 1927.

[116] *The Śaiva School of Hinduism*, London, 1934.

[117] *The Origin and Early History of Śaivism in South India*, Madras, 1936.

[118] *Studies in Tamil Literature*, 1942.

[119] *Śaiva Religion*, Madras, 1950.

[120] *History of Indian Philosophy*, V, Cambridge, 1955.

[121] *The Religion and Philosophy of Tevaram*, Madras, 1958–59.

[122] *Development of Religion in South India*, Madras, 1963; *The Culture and History of the Tamils*, Calcutta, 1964.

[123] *Schools of Śaivism*, Calcutta, 1970.

[124] *Studies in the Śaiva Siddhānta*, Madras, 1911; Nallaswami Pillai edited and translated, with intro. and notes the *Śivajñānabodham*, Dharmapuram, 1945, and *Śiva-*

critically analysed by V. Pranjoti (1938).[125] An historical study on the Śaiva Siddhānta was made by G.S. Pillai[126] while the 36 *tattvas* which constitute the substratum of the Śaiva Siddhānta philosophy were dealt with in detail by T.M.P. Mahadevan (1955).[127] On Śivādvaita, an allied system an authoritative work was done by S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri (1930).[128]

Details of the works on the Śaiva Siddhānta and also of the two other main branches of later Śaivism—viz. the Kāśmīra Śaivism and the Liṅgāyata of Vīraśaivism—will be provided in the next volume because they do not directly come under the purview of the ancient period. Here are only some glimpses of them. A special form of Śaivism flourished in the Kashmir region from about the ninth century AD. This was known as Kāśmīra Śaivism. According to this system the individual souls and the world are identical with Śiva. The process through which Śiva is manifested in the form of the individual souls and the world is known as Spanda. Pratyabhijñā is the means of realising the experience of Śiva's identity with individual souls. The main tenets of Kāśmīra Śaivism were presented in an historical outline by Sir R.G. Bhandarkar (1913). Subsequently it was taken up by many scholars with the publication of the texts pertaining to it. J.C. Chatterji's most authoritative *Kashmir Śaivism* which was first published in 1914 dealt in its first part with the history and literature of Kāśmīra Śaivism introducing the Āgama, Spanda and Pratyabhijñā Śāstras and in its second part with the main doctrines of the system throwing light on the concept of *ātman*, the process of manifestation, the transcendent Parama Śiva, the five principles of the universal subject-object (Śiva, Śakti, Sadakhya, Aiśvarya, Sadvidyā), Māyā and her progeny, two principles of the limited individual subject-object, *puruṣa, prakṛti* and the *guṇas*, principles of mental operation (*buddhi, ahaṃkāra* and *manas*), the means and general principles of sensible experience (the five senses, five power of action and five general objects of sense perception) and the principles of materiality (the five *bhūtas*). The second was K.C. Pande's *Abhinavagupta: An Historical*

jñānasiddhiyar, Dharmapuram, 1948. *The Śivaprakāśam* etc. were translated by Hoisington in *JAOS* as early as in 1854.

[125] *Śaiva Siddhānta in the Meykaṇḍa Śāstra*, London, 1938.

[126] *Introduction to the History of Śaiva Siddhānta*, Annamalainagar, 1948.

[127] *The Idea of God in the Śaiva Siddhānta*, Annamalainagar, 1948.

[128] *The Śivādvaita of Śrikaṇṭha*, Madras, 1930.

and Philosophical Study, (Varanasi, 1936). Abhinavagupta was the greatest exponent of Kāśmīra Śaivism having a great place also in the Śākta Tantric tradition. Besides his two commentaries on the Pratyabhijñā Śāstra, he also composed the *Tantrāloka, Tantrasāra, Paramārthasāra* and other important works which were analysed by Pande and as such this work had been a veritable encyclopaedia of Kāśmīra Śaivism.[129] An excellent summary of the history and doctrines of the Kāśmīra Śaivism was supplied by Arabinda Basu in the fourth volume of the *Cultural Heritage of India* (1956) while its philosophical tenets were dealt with in detail by J.N. Sinha (1970).

Liṅgāyata or Vīraśaiva was a militant form of Śaivism with emphasis on social reform, equality of men and women, female education and widow-remarriage, extermination of poverty and so on which flourished in the Karnataka region about the 12th century AD. According to this system, Śiva as Brahman is both material and efficient cause of the world. Through his Śakti he is the material cause and in his own nature efficient cause. The relation is relative and not indicative of a real difference for there is identity between Sakti and Śaktimat, as between attribute and substance. This emphasis on Śakti had brought Vīraśaivism very close to Śākta-Tantric ideas, and that is why in the texts and tradition of the latter the Śakti-Viśiṣṭādvaitavāda of Vīraśaivism was held in high esteem. Being a very organised community the Liṅgāyatas or Vīraśaivas themselves made efforts to make the essentials of their own system known to others as a result of which numerous works on the religious, philosophical and social doctrines of the Vīraśaivas came to light. Specially important were the works of S.D. Pawate (1927),[130] S.C. Nandimath (1942),[131] M.R. Sakhare (1942),[132] Kumarswamiji (1949),[133] etc. A work on the origin and early history of Vīraśaivism mainly on the basis of epigraphical evidence was done by P.B. Desai (1968)[134] in which the events of the reign of the

[129]The original texts of Kāśmīra Śaivism were published in *The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies*.

[130]*Vīraśaiva Philosophy of the Śaivāgamas*, Hubli, 1927.

[131]*Handbook of Vīraśaivism*, Dharwar, 1942.

[132]*History and Philosophy of Liṅgāyata Religion*, Belgaum, 1942.

[133]*The Vīraśaiva Philosophy and Mysticism*, Dharwar, 1949. Cf. also his chapter on Vīraśaivism in the *Cultural Heritage*, vol. IV.

[134]*Baseveśvara and His Times*, Dharwar, 1968. Review by the present author in *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, Cal. University, III, 1970; cf. G. Marulasiddaiah, 'Basava,

Kalacurya king Vijjala, the career and achievements of Basava, the founder of the sect, and the main tenets of early Vīraśaivism along with its literature were discussed. Fleet held that Basava was not the original founder of Vīraśaivism. It was founded by Ekāntade Ramayya. Lorenzen held that there existed cordial relations between the Vīraśaivas and the Kālāmukhas before Vasava. According to R.G. Bhandarkar, the Vīraśaiva sect originated out of the Ārādhya sect which existed even in the days of Śaṅkara who, according to Ānandagiri, came into conflict with it. S.C. Nandimath held that the Vīraśaivas absorbed several elements and *maṭhas* of the Kālāmukhas. The social outlook of the Vīraśaivas was treated by McCormack,[135] Sahasrabuddha[136] and others.

Coming to the general historical works dealing with the origin and development of Śaivism on the basis of Vedic and subsequent literary evidence and also the evidence furnished by the inscriptions, coins, images etc. we find that the earlier stream of research, with varying interpretation, was continued as before. The Vedic concept of Rudra-Śiva and its metamorphosis in the epics and Purāṇas and also in the literary and epigraphic materials of the subsequent historical period, the transition from aniconism to iconism, from the earlier *liṅga* form of the deity of various Śiva images, the new dimensions that Śaivism received in the course of its long history and allied features of this cult were treated by a host of scholars.[137] V.S. Pathak (1960) threw important light on the Śaiva cults in northern India.[138] According to him a historical person named Śrīkaṇṭha was founder of the Pāśupata order. He held that there were at least two Kuśikas among the spiritual descendants of Lakulīśa, one belonging to the second century BC and the other to the fourth century AD. He supported R.G. Bhandarkar's

the Saint Ruler of Karnataka' in *Prof. S.K. Bhuyan Com. Volume*, Gauhati, 1966, 232 ff.; H.T. Swamy, *The Vīraśaiva Saints—A Study*, Mysore, 1968.

[135]'Lingayat as a Sect' in *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute*, no. 93, pt. I, 1963, 59–71.

[136]'Mahātmā Basaveśvara—A Social Reformer', *PIHC*, 1979, 221 ff.

[137]Cf. R.N. Dandekar, *Rudra in the Veda*, Poona; Yaduvamsi, *Śaiva Mata*, Patna, 1955; V.S. Bhandari, 'Rudra as the Supreme God in the Yajurveda' in *Nagpur University Journal*, XVI, 1965, 37–42; P. Banerjee 'Some Aspects of Early History of Śaivism' in *Indo-Asian Culture*, XIV, 1965, 216–31; R.C. Hazra, 'An Overlooked Aspect of Rgvedic Rudra' in *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, V, 1971–72, 123–48; V.S. Agrawala, *Śiva Mahādeva: The Great God*, Varanasi, 1966; etc.

[138]*History of the Śaiva Cults in Northern India*, Varanasi, 1960.

equation of Karuṣa with Kārukasiddhāntins (which was contested by Lorenzen) and pointed out that an inscription of AD 1177 described Kālānnas as adhering to the Lakulāgama *samaya* and another record tracing the origin of Kālāmukha ascetics to Lakulīśa. He also referred to other branches of the Pāśupatas from the inscriptions such as Ananta, Capala, Pranama, etc. On the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas his findings were important. Among other principal publications of the sixties mention should be made of V.S. Agrawala's *Śiva-Mahādeva: The Great God* (1966) was an exposition of the symbolism of Śiva against the backdrop of the totality of ancient Indian Culture in which the art traditions had also been incorporated.

In the field of symbolic studies in relation to the cult and mythology of Śiva, the name of W.D. O'Flaherty is popular among the scholars whose *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Śiva* (1973)[139] applied a structuralist method to a corpus of Śiva mythology. According to her "the mythology of Śiva forms only a small part of the material of the Purāṇas, but it is an ideal model which reveals a pattern to the material as a whole. Śiva is not only an extremely important Hindu god; he is in many ways the most uniquely Indian god of them all, and the principles which emerge from an intensive study of his mythology lie at the very heart of Hinduism". Her purpose was "simply to understand the myths *in situ*, to use methods which reveal the meanings that the Hindus saw in them to enjoy them as the exotic and delightful creations that they are". She claimed to have traced the development of an Indian approach to an enduring human dilemma; the conflict between spiritual aspirations and human desires. The work treated hundreds of related myths and examined a wide range of Indian texts centring upon the stories of Śiva whose erotic *alter ego*, according to O'Flaherty, was Kāma. In the introductory portion of this work she dealt with the interpretation of Hindu mythology, its problems and methods, the motifs and contradictions. The subsequent chapters were under the titles: Asceticism and Eroticism in Early Indian Mythology; The Vedic Antecedents of Śiva; Śiva and

[139]Subsequently reissued in 1981 under the title *Śiva: The Erotic Ascetic*. Her other works connected with Śaivism included 'Asceticism and Sexuality in the Mythology of Śiva' in *History of Religions*, VIII (4) 1969, 300–37; IX(1), 1969, 1–41; 'The Symbolism of the Third Eye of Śiva in the Purāṇas' in *Purāṇa*, XI (2), 1969, 273–84; 'The Submarine Mara in the Mythology of Śiva' in *JRAS*, 1971 (1), 9–27; 'The Symbolism of Ashes in the Mythology of Śiva' in *Purāṇa*, XIII (1), 1971, 26–35.

Brahmā: Opposition and Identity; Śiva and Kāma; Śiva in the Pine Forest; Śiva as Ascetic and Householder; The Control and Transformation of Desire; Cycles of Asceticism and Sexuality; The Pendulum of Extremes. Her final conclusion: "In many myths Śiva is merely erotic or merely ascetic, as a momentary view of one phase or another. But in the great myths, transcending the limits of mundane causality, he participates in cycles of cosmic dimensions which melt into a single image as they become ever more frequent, making an almost sublimical impression in their brief symbolic appearances, creating an infinitely complex mosaic. The conflict is resolved not into a static icon but rather into the constant motion of the pendulum, whose animating force is the eternal paradox of the myths".

Among the works of purely historical character Pranabananda Jash's *History of Śaivism* (Calcutta, 1974) was an attempt to reconstruct the history of Śaivism from archaeological and literary sources. In this work special emphasis was on different Śaiva subsects which arose in India from the seventh century onwards as a result of the diverse influences including Tantrism which penetrated Indian religion and culture at that time. A detailed account of the Siddhānta school of Śaivism, the Pāśupatas and their two extreme heterodox subsects, the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, and other regional forms of Śaivism, i.e. the Nāyanār Śaivas of Tamil region, the Vīraśaivas or Liṅgāyatas of the Kannada region and the Trika Śaivism of Kashmir, was included along with their respective doctrines and tenets. An attempt was also made to correlate contemporary iconographical types like the Harihara, Ardhanārīśvara, Umāmaheśvara, Kalyāṇasundara and others with the different Śaiva sects and to trace their affinities with other non-Śaiva sects, such as the Śāktas, the Sauras and so on. R.K. Siddhantasastree's *Śaivism Through the Ages* (New Delhi, 1975) was also historical in approach, but the author of this work had an outlook which was significantly different from most scholars who worked on Śaivism. According to him, the pre-Aryan, non-Aryan, tribal, popular and other elements which most scholars sought to characterise the constituents of the god Śiva were also the characteristics of all deities of all religions, even those pertaining to modern monotheistic cults throughout the world and as such these elements should not be unduly emphasised. Śaivism in itself, so far as the texts indicated, should be equated with the totality of Hinduism and its

theological and philosophical aspects were totally at par with the entirety of Hindu tradition which evolved through the ages and its difference with other systems which in various ways was emphasised by scholars made no sense in the last analysis. He held that the late legends pertaining to the Liṅga cult found in some Purāṇas could hardly prove the prevalence of the *liṅga*-worship among the Vedic Aryans. He did not believe that the Śiva-liṅga was originally the phallic emblem of Śiva, for in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* the lord was described as thumb-shaped which might have been the source of the idea of the phallus-like shape of Śiva.

Among the more recent publications, K. Sivaraman's *Śaivism in Philosophical Perspective* was a study on the formative concepts, problems and methods of the Śaiva Siddhānta. R.A. Dunuvila's study on the Śaiva Siddhānta (1983) was based on the doctrines connected with the concept of Aghoraśiva.[140] The philosophical-historical study of Śaivism by K.C. Pande and R.C. Diwedi[141] proved to be a substantial contribution to this field after the work of J.N. Sinha. Another historical study deserving special mention was M. Chakravarti's *The Concept of Rudra Śiva Through the Ages* (New Delhi, 1986). B. Biswal's *Cult of Śiva* (Calcutta, 1988) was a study of the history of Śaivism especially of the Orissa region. Compared to the works on Vaiṣṇavism, those of Śaivism were numerically smaller which could be grouped under several distinct categories. To the first category belonged the works dealing with the primitive substratum of Śaivism, especially with the Phallism associated with it, the recent work on this line being B. Bhattacharyya's *Śaivism and the Phallic World* (New Delhi, 1975, revised edition, 1993). Other categories comprised studies on the early history of Śaivism, Pāśupatism and its extremistic offshoots, the hymns of the southern Śaiva saint-poets, and the religio-philosophical systems of the Śaiva Siddhānta, Vīraśaivism and Kāśmīra Śaivism. Studies in Śiva mythology received a particular culmination in O'Flaherty's work, but she was not able to exhaust the whole of it. The medieval *bhakti* movements marked a revival of Vaiṣṇavism all over India, though in a more unsophisticated form. The same did not happen in the case of Śaivism, and instead of organised sectarian movements, here we come across a process of ruralisation in course of which numerous rural deities were identified with Śiva, and their legends gave the original

[140] *Śaiva Śiddhānta Theology*, New Delhi, 1983.

[141] *An Outline of the History of Śaiva Philosophy*, New Delhi, 1986.

Śiva mythology a new turn which is found in the regional literatures of India. This aspect of Śiva mythology was not seriously studied, though in Bengal it was partly done by the researchers of Bengali literature. Moreover, much of Śaivism, in its doctrinal level, was absorbed by Śāktism, and in the works on the latter, to which we shall have the occasion to refer in the next section, many features of Śaivism were also discussed, because both the systems were very often regarded as the two aspects of the same religious expression.

V

Śāktism accompanied with Tantrism (though the latter did not belong to Śāktism alone but pertained to most religious systems of India including Vaiṣṇavism) were discussed almost in all the general works on Indian religion mentioned in the preceding chapter. Earlier Western writers like Monier-Williams, Barth, Hopkins and others sought to trace the origin of Śāktism in the cosmogonical concept of sexual dualism according to which Śakti was the energy of the Supreme Being by which it produced, preserved and destroyed the world. This Śakti or energy was conceived of as a Female Principle. They also admitted that the personification of Śakti was not peculiar to Śaivism alone. Each god had his own, and Lakṣmī by the side of Viṣṇu, and Sarasvatī by the side of Brahmā, played the same part as Devī by the side of Śiva. The union of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā was at times conceived of in a quite similar way though the erotic mysticism, which figured to such an extent in these representations had, in the cult of Kṛṣṇa, taken in general a different course. But it was in Śaivism that these ideas had found a soil most favourable for their expansion, and that they had been distorted into the most monstrous developments. As many as an entire half of the Śaivite religious were, in fact, characterised by the cult of an androgynous or female divinity. These cults appeared to have become complicated with ritual observances either of a horrible or of an obscure nature, which must have led to their being relegated to a special literature of occult character—the Tantras.

Most of the nineteenth-century Western scholars of Indian religious systems regarded Tantra as a degraded form of Hinduism which consisted of the most barbarous, repulsive and obnoxious elements.[142] "The use of animal food and spirituous liquors, in-

[142] H.H. Wilson, *Essays and Lectures on the Religion of the Hindu*, London, 1862, I, 248–57; M. Monier-Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, London, 1875, 501 ff.; *Brahmanism and*

dulged to in excess, is the rule of these strange ceremonies, to which Śakti is worshipped in the person of a naked woman, and the proceedings terminate with the carnal copulation of the initiated, each couple representing Bhairava and Bhairavī (Śiva and Devī), and becoming thus for the moment identified with them. This is *śrīcakra*, 'the holy circle', or the *pūrṇābhiṣeka*, 'the complete consecration', the essential act or rather fore-estate of salvation, the highest rite of this delirious mysticism.... In fact a Śākta of the left hand is almost always a hypocrite and a superstitious debauchee".[143] Indian scholars also believed that obscenity was the soul of this cult which demanded every excess that liquor and lust could prompt. The great Bengali writer and Hindu revivalist, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, viewed Tantra as a misguiding principle which offered only wine and woman in the name of religion. R.L. Mitra did not hesitate to state that in Tantra "theories are indulged in and practices enjoined which are at once the most revolting and horrible that human depravity could think of and compared to which the words and specimens of Holiwell street literature would appear absolutely pure".[144] This aversion continued even into the first half of the 20th century. Insisting on its so called vulgar aspects, Benoytosh Bhattacharyya, who was one of the pioneers in the field of Vajrayānic studies, frankly observed that "if at any time in the history of India the mind of the nation as a whole has been diseased it was in the Tantric age, or the period immediately preceding the Muhammedan conquest of India. The story related in the pages of numerous Tantric works is supposed to be so repugnant that, excepting a few, all respectable scholars have condemned them wholesale and left the field of study severely alone".[145]

But side by side there was a different approach. A.S. Geden asserted that two-thirds of the Hindu religious rites are Tantric and almost half of Indian medicine.[146] According to Sir Charles Eliot, "Apart from the ceremonial which they inculcate, the general principles of Tantra breathe a liberal and intelligent spirit. Caste-restrictions are minimized; travelling is permitted; women are

Buddhism, London, 1891, 191 ff.; E.W. Hopkins, *The Religions of India*, Boston, 1885, 489–92; etc.

[143]A. Barth, *The Religions of India*, London, 1882, 205.

[144]Quoted in H.P. Sastri's *Bauddha Dharma* (in Bengali), 82.

[145]*Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism*, Oxford, 1924, Pref.

[146]*ERE*, XII, 193.

honoured; they can act as teachers; the burning of widows is forbidden; girl-widows may remarry; and the murder of women is peculiarly heinous. Prostitution is denounced. Whereas Christianity is sometimes accused of restricting its higher code to Church and Sundays, the opposite may be said of Tantrism. Outside the temple its morality is excellent".[147] In a letter addressed to Sir John Woodroffe, Śivacandra Vidyārṇava wrote: "At the present time the general public are ignorant of the principles of Tantra Śāstra. The cause of this ignorance is the fact that the Tantra Śāstra is a Sādhana Śāstra, the greater part of which becomes intelligible only by *sādhanā*. For this reason the Śāstra and its teachers prohibit their general promulgation. So long as the Śāstra was learnt from the gurus only, the golden rule was of immense good. In course of time the old *sādhanā* has become almost extinct, and along with it, the knowldege of the deep and mighty principles of the Śāstra is almost lost. Nevertheless some faint shadowings of these principles have been put before the public partly with a view to preserve Śāstric knowledge from destruction, and partly for commercial reasons. When I commenced to write *Tantratattva* some 25 years ago, Bengali society was in a perilous state, owing to the influx of other religions, want of faith and a spirit of disputation. Shortly before this a number of English books had appeared on the Tantra Śāstra which, whilst ignorant of *dharma*, *sādhanā* and *siddhi*, contained some hideous and outrageous pictures, drawn by Bengali historians and novelists ignorant of, and unfaithful to, Śāstric principles. The English book by English writers contained merely a reflection of what English educated Bengalis of those days had written. Both are even today equally ignorant of the Tantra Śāstra."[148]

Owing to the efforts of Śivacandra Vidyārṇava, Panchanan Tarkaratna, Sir John Woodroffe, Atal Bihari Ghosh, Gopinath Kaviraj, etc. there was attempt at the beginning of this century to make a correct estimate of the Tantras, to understand what the Tantras really meant and to interpret the Tantric teachings in terms of other religio-philosophical systems against the background of the totality of the Indian tradition. Sir John Woodroffe

[147]*Hinduism and Buddhism*, London, 1921, II, 285.

[148]Woodroffe, *Śakti and Śākta*, Madras, 1929, 9–10. A free translation of Vidyārṇava's *Tantratattva* was published by Woodroffe in 1914 under the title *Principles of the Tantra*.

who was described as the Max Müller of the Tantric studies, under the pseudonym Arthur Avalon, initiated the publication of the Tantric Texts Series the first volume of which, *Tantrābhidhāna* edited by Woodroffe himself came out in 1913. Among other texts edited by Woodroffe and published in the same series mention may be made of the *Pādukāpañcaka* and *Ṣaṭcakranirūpaṇa* (vol. II, 1913), *Prapañcasāra* (vol. III, 1914), *Kulacūḍāmaṇi* (vol. IV, 1915), *Kulārṇava* (vol. V, 1917), *Kālīvilāsa* (vol. VI, 1917), *Śrīcakrasambhāra* (vol. VII, 1919), *Tantrarājā* (vol. VIII, XII), *Kāmakalāvilāsa* (vol. X), *Mahānirvāṇa* (vol. XIII), *Kaulāvalinirṇaya* (vol. XIV), etc.[149] It should be pointed out in this connection that Rasik Mohan Chatterjee was the first to bring out various Tantric texts in a planned way in Bengali under the title *Vividha Tantra Saṅgraha* (Calcutta, 1881–86). In 1937 Panchanan Tarkaratna published his Śākta commentaries on the *Brahmasūtra* and the *Īśopaniṣat* in which he made a laudable attempt to put forward what is known as the Śākta viewpoint in Indian philosophical tradition. This was further developed by MM. Gopinath Kaviraj who also edited many Tantric works in the Sarasvatī Bhavan Text Series of Benares, besides his valuable works on Tantra in English, Hindi and Bengali.[150] Because of their complete dependence on the texts they had objectivity in their approach. They were apparently justified when they equated Tantrism with the totality of Hinduism because Tantric ideas are so inextricably blended with different aspects of the Hindu way of life that it becomes a matter of proverbial difficulty to separate the Tantric elements from the huge conglomeration of materials accrued in space and time.

The historical study of Tantrism has been handicapped, complicated and conditioned by the preoccupations of the writers in this field.[151] As Mircea Eliade had rightly observed: "When one approaches an exotic principality, one understands principally what

[149]Woodroffe also published an English translation of the *Saundaryalahari* (1917).

[150]See his 'Philosophy of Tripura Tantra' in *Sarasvati Bhavan Studies*, 1934, IX, 85–98; 'Some Aspects of the Philosophy of Śākta Tantra' in ibid., 1938, X, 21–27; 'Exposition of Śākta Belief' in *History of Philosophy: Eastern and Western*, Delhi, 1953, I, 401–28; *Tantrik Vāṅmaya main Śākta Dṛṣṭi*, Patna, 1963; *Tantra O Siddhānta*, Burdwan University, 1968.

[151]For a detailed bibliography of Tantric Studies see M.Eliade's *Yoga, Immortality and Freedom*, New York, 1958, special notes, 399–424, bibliography, 435–80 and A. Bharati's *The Tantric Tradition*, London, 1965, 302–36.

one is predestined to understand by one's own vocation, by one's own cultural orientation and that of the historical moment to which one belongs. This truism is of general application". As a result, in the field of Tantric studies we find the emergence of various theoretical approaches, each claiming to have explained all the intricacies in its own way. So far as the modern approaches are concerned the principal one seeks to find certain norms in Tantrism with a pragmatic anticipation of the peculiar and manifold mental, emotional and spiritual problems of our times, as if there are intended to explore the obscure zones of the unconscious to which are attributed the problems of man's psychological, social, cultural and religious conditioning. This approach found a very laudable expression in the works of Mircea Eliade.[152] The psychological approach had eventually resulted in the study of the so-called sexual elements found in the Tantras which were interpreted by the traditionalists as 'purely symbolical' and by others as 'appliedly symbolical'. Anyone working on Tantrism cannot ignore the sexual elements, but difficulty arises when the entire Tantric tradition is superimposed on these elements, even by scholars of the rank of Agehananda Bharati, Giuseppe Tucci and others.[153]

Tantric studies have often been blended with studies on Śāktism, because in the Śākta religion Tantrism had found the most solid ground of its expression though, as we have seen above, Tantrism was a feature of other religious systems as well. The development of the concept of Female Principle in different religious systems—such as *śūnyatā* or *prajñā* in later Buddhism, Lakṣmī or Rādhā in Vaiṣṇavism, Śāsanadevatās in Jainism, Śakti in differ-

[152]*Le Yoga: Immortalite et Liberte*, Paris, 1954; Eng. trans. by W.R. Trask, New York, 1958. See also his *Metallurgy, Magic and Alchemy*, Paris, 1938; *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques on Ecstasy*, Princeton, 1968.

[153]A. Bharati, *The Ochre Robe*, London, 1961; *The Tantric Tradition*, London, 1965; 'Metaphysics of Tantrism' in *Quest*, XXV, 1962; G. Tucci, *Theory and Practice of Maṇḍala*, London, 1961; *Ratilīlā: An Interpretation of the Tantric Imagery of the Temples of Nepal*, Geneva, 1969; P. Thomas, *Kāmakalā: Hindu Ritual or Love*, Bombay, 1960; M.R. Anand, *Kāmakalā: Some Notes on the Philosophical Basis of Hindu Erotic Sculpture*, New York, 1958; *Tantric Magic* (in collaboration with A. Mookherjee), New Delhi, 1977; O.V. Garrison, *Tantra: The Yoga of Sex*, New York, 1964; C.G. Jung, *Mandala Symbolism*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Princeton, 1972; N. Douglas, *Tantra Yoga*, New Delhi, 1971; A. Mookherjee, *Tantra Art*, Delhi, 1966; *Tantra Āsana*, Basel, 1971; *The Tantric Way* (with M. Khanna), New York, 1977; P. Rawson, *The Art of Tantras*, London, 1973; P. Rendel, *Introduction to the Cakras*, Northamptonshire, 1974.

ent forms in Śaivism, various Mother Goddess in local or regional cults and the rituals associated with them—invariably led to some forms of Tantrism and in Śāktism, in which the highest place was accorded to the Female Principle Tantrism was bound to be its container. It should also be said in this connection that Śāktism was not absolutely independent of Śaivism and in it Śiva had a role as a complementary Male Principle suggesting a sexual dualism in the process of creation. In the monistic interpretation of Śāktism, Śiva and Śakti were the two aspects of the same reality in inseparable relation like fire and heat, the former representing the static and the latter the kinetic aspect of the same energy.

As early as in 1910 D.N. Pal[154] made an intensive study of the Puranic legends pertaining to Śiva and Devī and tried to interpret them in terms of the main trend of Hindu religio-philosophical ideas. In 1916, R.P. Chanda brought a new approach in the study of Śāktism.[155] He asserted that "for the conception of the godhead analogous to the Śākta conception of the Devī we should travel beyond the countries dominated by the Vedic Indians and the Avestic Iranians to Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt and other countries bordering on the Mediterranean. There is a strong resemblance between the Indian Śākta conception of Śakti and the Śākta ritual of the followers of Vāmācāra and Kulācāra, who practised ceremonial promiscuity on the one hand and the Semitic conception of Astarte, the Egyptian conception of Isis and the Phrygian conception of Cybele on the other". He also held that the concept of the Mother Goddess as the Supreme Being could only develop in a society which was female-dominated. Chanda's views were accepted in 1931 by Sir John Marshall[156] who, while dealing with the Mother Goddess figurines from Mohenjo-daro, associated the Harappan Mother Goddesses with those of Western Asia and elsewhere and was inclined to attribute a matriarchal origin to them. In 1941 Baron Omar Rolf Ehrenfels[157] insisted on the matriarchal origin of the cult of the Mother Goddess in which connection he explored matriarchal elements among various tribes and castes of India. In 1942 S.K. Dikshit[158] had demonstrated the basic similarity

[154] *Śiva and Śakti*, Calcutta, 1910.

[155] 'Race and Cult: Śāktism' in *Indo-Aryan Races*, Rajshahi, 1916.

[156] *Mohenjodaro and the Indus Civilization*, London, 1931, I, 48 ff.

[157] *Mother-right in India*, Hyderabad, 1941.

[158] *The Mother Goddess*, Poona, 1942.

of features of the Indian cults of the Mother Goddess with those of Western Asia, Egypt and ancient Europe. In 1955 Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya[159] suggested that Śāktism, Tantrism and the philosophical Sāṅkhya belonged to the same religio-philosophical complex whose parallels were found elsewhere in Western Asia and Egypt and the origin of which should be traced to a pre-Vedic matriarchal condition.

Another probable source of the Śākta-Tantric ideas was traced beyond the Himalayan borders. In 1900, Haraprasad Sastri pointed out the connection of the goddess Tārā with Tibet and China and the Vāmācāra practices with those of China.[160] Sylvain Lévi (1905) held on the authority of the *Tārātantra* and other works described by Sastri, that the worship of Tārā and the Tantric Vāmācāra practices came from China.[161] In 1924 B.T. Bhattacharyya[162] and in 1929 Sir John Woodroffe[163] endorsed the same view. P.C. Bagchi (1939)[164] tried to establish the identity of Mahācīnatārā with Ekajaṭā whose cult was said to have been recovered by Siddha Nāgārjuna in Tibet. According to the *Sammoha Tantra*, Nīlasarasvatī or Ugratārā, other names of Ekajaṭā, was born in a lake called Cola on the Western side of the Meru which was included in Cīna-deśa. Bagchi suggested that *cola* was probably to be connected with the common word for 'lake', *kul* or *col*, which was found with the names of so many lakes to the west and north of T'ien-shan, that is to say, the pure Mongolian zone. Bagchi had also referred to a number of countries beyond India, enumerated and described in the Tantric texts as the centres of Tantric cultures. As regards the Chinese sexual techniques and their impact on Tantra the following observation of K.H. Van Gulik, as presented to us by H. Goetz,[165] was important: "This (sexual) practice, again, has been

[159] *Lokāyata*, Delhi, 1959; the original Bengali appeared in 1955.

[160] *Notices of Sanskrit MSS*, Second Series, I, 1900.

[161] *Nepal*, Paris, 1905, I, 346.

[162] *Buddhist Esoterism*, Oxford, 1924, 43 ff.

[163] *Śakti and Śākta*, Madras, 1929, 132 ff.

[164] *Studies in the Tantras*, Calcutta, 1939. Bagchi's other works are *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, Calcutta, 1934; 'Sandhyābhāṣā' in *Visvabharati Quarterly*, 1934; 'Primitive Elements in Jainism' in *JDL*, V, 1921, 349–64; 'On some Tantric Texts studied in Ancient Kambuja' in *IHQ*, V, 1928, 754–69; VI, 1930, 97–107; *Dohākoṣa*, Calcutta, 1938; cf. *JDL*, XXVIII, 1–180, XXX, 156; *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit-Chinois*, Paris, 1928, 1929; *Canon Bouddhique in Chine*, Paris, 1987–38; *India and China*, Calcutta, 1944.

[165] *ABORI*, XXXVI, 1956, 133 ff.

the starting point of a secret Tantric-Taoist ritual intended not only to increase the length of life but even to win immortality for the adepts.... This ritual sheds a flood of light on certain obscure doctrines and practices of Indian and Tibetan mysticism, especially on yoga, the Buddhist Siddhācāryas and the Kaulacakra of the Vāmācāra Śāktas". The story of Vasiṣṭha's visit to China on the advice of Tārā, his initiation into *cinācāra* by the Buddha himself, his return and preaching of those doctrines, the influence of Chinese Taoism on Indian Tantra and allied topics were dealt with by various scholars. Joseph Needham[166] said: "At the first sight, then Tantrism appears to have been an Indian importation to China. But closer inspection of the dates leads to a consideration, at least, of the possibility that the whole thing was really Taoist". S.K. Chatterji (1959) observed: "Just as certain schools of Buddhism like Dhyāna Buddhism of Bodhidharma became an important factor in Chinese Buddhist religious thought and practice, so it is believed that some later Taoist ideas and practices, which were partly religious, partly magical, partly scientific and partly also in the plane of an erotic or sexual ritualism with mystic and philosophical implications came into India from China. The sudden and widespread development of Tantric doctrines and practices, both among the Buddhists and the Brahmanists, from the second half of the first millennium after Christ, is rather significant in India".[167] The cult of Tārā which in the Buddhist garb pervaded China and Tibet and also found a powerful expression in Indian Śāktism was also seriously studied by scholars.[168]

[166] *Science and Civilization in China*, Cambridge, 1956, II, 33–164.

[167] *JAS*, I, 1959, 188 ff.

[168] On the earlier works on the Tārā cult, Hiranand Sastri's *Origin and Cult of Tārā*, MASI, XX, Calcutta, 1912 was important. D.C. Sircar's edited volume *Śakti Cult and Tārā*, Calcutta, 1967 contains a few thought-provoking articles. Among recent works G. Beyer's *The Cult of Tārā: Magic and Ritual in Tibet*, London, 1973 deserves special mention. See also L.A. Waddell, 'The Indian Buddhist Cult of Avalokita and His Consort Tārā' in *JRAS*, 1894, 51–89; *The Buddhism of Tibet*, London, 1895; A. Getty, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism*, Oxford, 1914; A.K. Gordon, *The Iconography of Tibetan Lamaism*, New York, 1939; W.E. Clark, *Two Lamaistic Pantheons*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1987, B.T. Bhattacharyya, *Indian Buddhist Iconography*, Calcutta, 1958; D.C. Bhattacharyya, *Studies in Buddhist Iconography*, New Delhi, 1978. On Chinese-Tibetan influence see Chou-yi-Linag, 'Tantrism in China' in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, VIII, 1945, 241–332; C.Y. Chang, 'An Introduction to Taoist Yoga' in *Review of Religion*, XXI, New York, 1956, 131–48; G.C.C. Chang, *Esoteric Teachings of the Tibetan Tantra*, New York, 1968.

Since the Tantras lay special emphasis on the renovation of the body through drugs made of various alchemical process, and specially those prepared from mercury and mica identified with Śiva and Śakti respectively and also on the disciplining of the physical body through various yogic practices, the ancient Indian texts on alchemy, medicine and yoga were conspicuously associated with Tantrism, though all these pertained to other non-Tantric systems also. It was Acarya Prafulla Chandra Ray (1861–1944) the renowned chemical scientist who was the first to proclaim boldly that Indian chemistry had very largely derived its colour, flavour and nourishment from the Tantras which were repositories of a great amount of chemical information and many alchemical recipes. In fact his celebrated *History of Indian Chemistry*[169] was mainly based on Tantric treatises. In this work he not only gave copious quotations from the extant Tantric texts but also reproduced extracts and relevant portions of the texts in the appendices. H.P. Sastri recorded the existence of two treatises by Nāgārjuna in the Nepal collection of manuscripts (1905, 1915).[170] In 1932, M.M. Vidhusekhar Sastri referred to four Sanskrit treatises on alchemy as translated into Tibetan and K.C. Viraraghava to the alchemical works of the Tamil Sittars.[171] In 1951 D.V. Subha Reddy published a list of 27 works of the Sittars indicating the nature of their contents originally prepared by W. Ainslie[172] adding an extra list of 38 Tamil books. Likewise, there had been no dearth of publications on yoga. Being one of the traditional six branches of Indian philosophy yoga had been approached from various viewpoints.[173] Its associa-

[169] Vol. I, 1902; vol. II, 1908; now incorporated into the nicely edited *History of Chemistry in Ancient and Medieval India*, ed. Priyadaranjan Ray, Calcutta, 1956.

[170] *A Catalogue of Palm Leaf and Selected Paper MSS. belonging to the Durbar Library of Nepal*, I, 1905, 135; II, 1915, 75.

[171] *Ācārya Prafulla Chandra Ray Volume*, Calcutta, 1932, 121 ff., 460. Most of the works of the Sittars are scattered as manuscripts which are to be found in Madras Oriental Manuscript Library, Sarfoji Maharaja's Library at Tanjore, Aduthurai *maṭha* at Tanjore and at various south Indian *maṭhas*.

[172] *Madras Medical Journal*, II, no. 2. See also R.K. Mookherjee's, *Rasajalanidhi or Ocean of Indian Chemistry and Alchemy*, 5 vols., Calcutta, 1926–38; R.V. Patavardhan, "Rasavidyā or Alchemy in Ancient India' in *Proc. and Transc. of the First Oriental Conference 1919*, Poona, 1920; J. Filliozat, *The Classical Doctrine of Indian Medicine*, Eng. trans. D.R. Chanana, Delhi, 1964.

[173] The *Yogasūtra* of Patañjanli was translated with the *bhāṣya* of Vyāsa and with notes from Vācaspati's *Tattvaratnāvali*, Vijnānabhikṣu's *Yogavārttika* and Bhoja's

tion with various systems of religious practice and spiritual exercise caused the emergence of a vast literature, the representative works being S.N. Dasgupta's *Yoga as Philosophy and Religion* (London, 1924) and *Yoga Philosophy in relation to Other Systems of Indian Thought* (Calcutta, 1935). The special association of yoga with Tantrism and the psychological considerations behind it which was developed in time, space and tradition had been masterly dealt with in M. Eliade's *Le Yoga: Immortalite et Liberte* (Paris, 1954; Eng. trans. by W.R. Trask, New York, 1958). The translation of the *Haṭhayogapradīpikā*, to which the followers of Tantrism attach much importance was made by T.R.S. Ayyangar (Madras, 1913). It was also studied by T. Bernard[174] and subsequently by H.V. Rieker.[175] Among the works dealing with the association of Tantrism with the yogic practices mention should be made of H. Zimmer's 'Zur Bedeutung des Indischen Tantro-Yoga'[176] and the works of A. Danielou,[177] P.H. Pott[178] and Nik Douglas.[179] Studies on Tibetan yoga, to a great extent relevant to the Indian Śākta-Tantric ideas and practices, have been referred to in our chapter on Buddhism. The ritualistic and symbolic aspects of Tantrism were vividly dealt with in the work of A. Bharati (1965) referred to above. There had also been no dearth of works on the individual aspects of the rituals the symbols and the concepts behind them. Among important works belonging to this category mention should be made of those made by C.W. Leadbreath (1927),[180] G. Rele (1927),[181] J. Przylusky (1934),[182] R. Vira and S. Taki (1938),[183] G.

Rājamārtaṇḍa by MM. Ganganath Jha. It was also translated by Rama Prasad in the *Sacred Books of the Hindus series*, by R.L. Mitra in *Bib. Ind.* and by J.H. Woods in *JAOS* and Harvard Oriental Series. See also E.W. Hopkins, 'Yoga Techniques in the Great Epic', *JAOS*, XXII, 1901, 333–79.

[174] *Haṭhayoga: Report of a Personal Experience*, New York, 1944.

[175] *The Yoga of Light: Haṭhayogapradīpikā*, New York, 1972.

[176] *Eranos Jahrbuch*, Zurich, 1933, I, 9–94.

[177] *Yoga: The Method of Reintegration*, London, 1949.

[178] *Yoga and Tantra*, Leiden, 1966.

[179] *Tantra Yoga*, New Delhi, 1971.

[180] *The Cakras*, Madras, 1927; rep. Madras, 1966, London, 1972.

[181] *Mysterious Kulakuṇḍalini*, Bombay, 1927.

[182] 'Mudra' in *Indian Culture*, II, 1934, 715–19.

[183] *A Dictionary of Tantric Syllabic Code*, Lahore, 1938.

Tucci (1961),[184] E.D. Saunders (1966),[185] L. Chandra (1969),[186] C.G. Jung (1972),[187] P. Rendel (1974),[188] etc.

Tantrism, as we have remarked above, was not confined to Śāktism alone since it found expression in other religious systems as well.[189] Similarly Śāktism was not solely based on Tantrism. It had an individual growth. Among specific works on Śāktism itself E.A. Payne's study on the Śāktas (1933)[190] was based on a spirit of historical enquiry in which the existing conditions were also taken into account. His arguments in regard to the question of the antiquity of the Hindu Tantras vis-à-vis those of the Buddhists were really convincing. S.K. Das (1934)[191] tried to prove that Śāktism had its origins in the Vedas. The concept of the Female Principle by which Śāktism was characterised was reflected by various suffixes of the Vedic words suggestive of divinities and this tradition of Female Principle which was formulated in the Vedas had an uninterrupted survival through the ages. A conceptual study of Śiva and Śakti from a Tantric viewpoint was made by A.B. Ghosh (1935)[192] who was himself an advocate of the neo-Tantric school founded by Vidyāṛṇava, Woodroffe and others. H.V. Glasenapp's 'Tantrismus und Saktismus' (1936)[193] was a brief but thought-provoking study on the interrelation between Tantrism and Śāktism. A.K. Coomaraswamy's 'The Tantric Doctrine of Divine Biunity' (1938)[194] was a psycho-philosophical study, a culmination in which was later achieved in the words of H.V. Guenther. A most comprehensive work on the origin and development of Śāktism based on literary sources was made by P.C. Chakravarti.[195] This author suddenly passed away when two-

[184] *Theory and Practice of Maṇḍala*, London, 1961.

[185] *Mudrā*, London, 1966.

[186] *Maṇḍalas of the Tantrasamuccaya*, Delhi, 1969.

[187] *Maṇḍala Symbolism*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull, Princeton, 1972.

[188] *Introduction to the Cakras*, Northamptonshire, 1974.

[189] Even in Jainism there was no dearth of Tantric elements. See P.C. Bagchi, 'Primitive Elements in Jainism' in *JDL*, V, 1921, 349–64; K.P. Mitra, 'Magic and Miracle in Jaina Literature' in *IHQ*, XV, 1939, 175–82; M.B. Jhaveri, *Comparative and Critical Study of the Mantraśāstra*, Ahmedabad, 1944; U.P. Shah, 'A Peep into the Early History of Tantra' in *Bhāratakaumudī*, II, Allahabad, 1947.

[190] *The Śāktas: An Introductory and Comparative Study*, Calcutta, 1933.

[191] *Śakti or Divine Power*, Calcutta, 1934.

[192] *Śiva and Śakti*, Rajshahi, 1935.

[193] *Ostasiatesche Zeitschrift*, XII, N.S., Berlin, 1936, 120–33.

[194] *ABORI*, XIX, 1938, 173–83.

[195] *Doctrine of Śakti in Indian Literature*, Calcutta, 1940.

thirds of the work was completed and the remaining portion was done by S. Radhakrishnan. V.R.R. Dikshitar (1942) made contribution to the study of the cult of Lalitā in which connection he had thrown significant light on the history of South Indian Śāktism.[196] S.B. Dasgupta[197] made an indepth study of the origin of the concept of the Female Principle in Mahāyāna Buddhism and its further development in other religious systems, including the popular ones, in the later periods of Indian religious history. Although his book did not deal directly with Śāktism, it was very important for the understanding of the theoretical concepts by which Śāktism was characterised. This also held good in the case of his second work (1950) which, although dealt with the Tantric phase of Buddhism, contributed significantly to the cause of Śākta-Tantric studies. Dasgupta's greatest contribution to Śāktism was in Bengali (1960)[198] in which work he traced the origin of the Śākta ideas to the Vedas and subsequent Sanskrit literature, identified its main tenets in Brahmanical, Buddhist and other literary traditions and dealt for the first time with the Śākta literature as found in the regional languages of India.

[196] *The Lalitā Cult*, Madras, 1942.

[197] *Obscure Religious Cults as Background of Bengali Literature*, Calcutta, 1946; *Introduction to Tantric Buddhism*, Calcutta, 1950. His *Śrī Rādhār Kramavikās* (in Bengali) was translated into Hindi. Although this work technically belonged to the category of Vaiṣṇavism, it dealt with the influence of the concept of Śakti on the former which crystallised in the form of Rādhā and as such had a great relevance to the study of Śāktism, especially in the conceptual aspects.

[198] *Bhārater Śakti Sādhanā O Śākta Sāhitya*, Calcutta, 1960. See also his 'Evolution of Mother Worship in India' in *Aspects of Indian Religious Thought*, Calcutta, 1957. In Bengali some good works on Śāktism and Tantrism were published. Reference has already been made to the Bengali works of Sivacandra Vidyārṇava and Gopinath Kaviraj. Among other important works in Bengali mention should be made of S. Bhattacharyya's *Tantra Paricaya*, Shantiniketan, 1952 and C. Chakravarti's *Tantrakathā*, Calcutta, 1960. The most authoritative work on Śāktism and Tantrism was, however, *Śāstramulak Bhāratiya Śaktisādhanā*, Shantiniketan, 1966, by Upendra Kumar Das. Published in two volumes consisting of about 1200 pages it contained 19 chapters, each under at least 50 sub-headings, dealing respectively with the primitive phase; goddess-cult outside India; the early Indian situation; the great goddess in the Vedic literature; the great goddess in post-Vedic literature, (a) Sanskrit literature, (b) in historical-archaeological documents, (c) in Greater India, (d) in Buddhist and Jain literature, and in non-Vedic popular tradition; the regional distribution of the goddess cult; Śiva; Śaiva philosophy; the mystery of Śakti; the spiritual exercise and Śākta philosophy; the way of spiritual exercise; various methods; the *pañcatattva* and *śavasādhanā*; initiation; meditation; worship; emblems and images; Yoga; and Tantra. More than 800 topics were discussed with reference to the original sources.

In 1948 was published D.C. Sircar's *The Śākta Pīṭhas*[199] which was based upon the text known as the *Pīṭhanirṇaya* or *Mahāpīṭhanirūpaṇa*. In this work, besides the text nicely edited from various manuscripts and identification of the *pīṭhas* or holy resorts of the Mother Goddess mentioned therein, the author had dealt with all the Śākta shrines and holy places associated with the Devī as found in the Indian literary tradition and showed how with the development with the concept of an all-pervading Female Principle, the local goddesses came to be identified with it and how the story of Dakṣa's sacrifice and death of Satī was fabricated to rationalise such identification. A very important contribution to the study of the Śākta-Tantric ideas was made by S.N. Dasgupta (1951) in his 'A General Introduction of Tantric Philosophy'.[200] D.N. Bose and H.L. Halder (1956)[201] tried to establish the broad principles underlying Tantrism and to explain the philosophical principles determining its forms of worship, the conception of the deity and its fundamental creed. The work contained the following chapters: Authority and Antiquity; Religion and Religions; Development of Tantras; Tantras through the Ages; Tantra and the Sāṅkhya Philosophy; Philosophy of Worship; Fundamental Creed of the Tantras; Śiva and Śakti; Mysticism in Tantra; Tantric Symbol and Practices; Some Mystic Techniques; Essential Principles of the Yoga; Human Koṣas and Nāḍīs; Cakras; The Goddess of the Tantras; The Ten Mahāvidyās; and Buddhist Tantras.

Among the principal works of the sixties we have already had the occasion to refer to the works of Agehananda Bharati, O. Garrison, A. Mookerji, E. Saunders, G. Tucci and P. Pott in connection with the specific Tantric subjects dealt with in them. Among other works of the sixties mention should be made of C. Cakravarti's *The Tantras: Studies on Their Religion and Literature* (Calcutta, 1963) which was mainly a collection of the revised versions of his earlier published papers.[202] Because of the simple descriptive nature of this work which presented the facts and the historical data as they were without any subjective interpretation by which

[199] *JRASB* (L), 1948, 1–108.

[200] *Philosophical Essays*, Calcutta, 1951.

[201] *Tantras: Their Philosophy and Occult Secrets*, Calcutta, 1956.

[202] 'Antiquity of Tantrism' in *IHQ*, VI, 114 ff.; 'Controversy regarding the Authorship of Tantras' in *K.B. Pathak Com. Volume*, 210–20; 'A Note on the Authorship and Age of the Tantras' in *JPASB*, N.S., XXIX, 71–79; 'Ideals of Tantra Rites' in *IHQ*, X,

the Tantric studies were mostly characterised, it had won admiration from all quarters and was referred to by all subsequent scholars who worked on Tantrism. The fifth volume of P.V. Kane's *magnum opus* contained a big and informative chapter on Tantrism which was appended by a useful descriptive bibliography.[203] Kane tried to provide all informations on Tantric beliefs and practices, though he frankly admitted that the Tantras failed to impress him at all. In 1967–68 M.P. Pandit published a number of books on Tantra.[204] His views were solely subjective and in most cases he restated the views of Woodroffe. He seemed also to have been inspired by some ideas of Sri Aurobindo. An important paper on the cult of Kālī based on literary sources was published by C.G. Hartman (Helsinki, 1969) under the title 'Aspects de la Desse Kali dans son Culte et dans la Literature Indianne'.

The primitive cult of the Mother Goddess which formed the substratum of both Tantrism and Śāktism was dealt with by the present author (1971),[205] in a socio-anthropological and historical perspective, following the line of George Thomson and Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya. The second edition of this work was, however, of a more general character which contained, besides the introduction, the following chapters: The Mothers—Forms of the cult; Mother Goddess in Literary and Mythological Records; Mother Goddess in Archaeology; Mother Goddess and the Advanced Religious Systems; Regional Distribution of the Mother Goddess cult; Female-dominated Societies and Fertility Rites as the basis of Tantrism. K.R. Van Kooij (1972) made a thorough study of the *Kālikā Purāṇa* to deal with the Devī worship in India.[206] An-

468 ff.; 'Śākta Festivals of Bengal and their Antiquity' in *IHQ*, XXVII, 255–60; 'Application of Vedic Mantras and Tantric Rites' in *JASB* (L), XVIII, 113 ff.; 'Kālī worship in Bengal' in *Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXI, 296–303. Among other important articles on Tantra mention should be made of A.K. Coomaraswamy's 'The Tantric Doctrine of Divine Bi-unity' in *ABORI*, XIX, 173–83 and R.C. Hazra's 'Influence of Tantras on the Tattvas of Raghunandana' in *IHQ*, IX, 678–704 and 'Influence of Tantra on the Smṛtinibandhas' in *ABORI*, XV, 220–35; XVI, 202–11.

[203] *History of Dharmaśāstra*, V (2), Poona, 1962, 1031–1151.

[204] *Gems from the Tantras*, Madras, 1967; *Studies on the Tantras and the Veda*, Madras, 1967; *Light on the Tantra*, Madras, 1968.

[205] *Indian Mother Goddess*, Calcutta, 1971; second ed., New Delhi, 1977. Cf. E.O. James, *Cult of the Mother Goddesss*, New York; E. Neumann, *The Great Mother*, New York, 1961.

[206] *Worship of the Goddess according to the Kālikā Purāṇa*, part I, Leiden, 1972.

other work to highlight the goddess tradition in early medieval times was C. Mackenzie Brown's *God as Mother, a Feminine Theology in India: an Historical and Theological Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa* (Hartford, 1974), Wendell C. Beane's *Myths, Cult and Symbols in Śākta Hinduism* (Leiden, 1977) was a phenomenological study of the Śakti cult. In another work (1974) the present author had dealt with the history of Śāktism chronologically from the prehistoric times to the modern period showing how the primitive conceptions of fertility and regeneration evolving out of the simple analogical association of earth and woman in terms of the magical principles of similarity and contiguity acquired new conceptual dimensions in subsequent ages and eventually came to serve as one of the driving principles of the Indian nationalistic movements.[207] The changes in contents and approach which characterised the history of Śāktism at different periods were traced, identified and documented. P. Kumar (1974) had also published a well documented volume on Śāktism mainly on the basis of literary sources, specially on the Purāṇas and Tantras.[208] David Kinsley's *The Sword and the Flute* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1975) offered a new approach to the Kālī aspect. Some of his thought-provoking papers pertaining to Rādhā and Kālī, published during the eighties will be mentioned later. M. Basu made a philosophical study of the Tantras (1976)[209] in five chapters dealing respectively with the historical retrospect, the definitions of Tattva, Mantra and Kalā along with their functional significance, critique of experience, ways of realisation and the role of Tantra in the modern age. The following comment of Kalidas Bhattacharyya on this book is worth-quoting: "Before presenting the philosophy of Tantra he (the author) has naturally to remove many of the unfortunate misconceptions of what Tantra is really about and has shown, in that connection, how, literally, it was and has even continued to be at the centre of all that is truly Indian in Indian culture. Philosophy that is relevant to life is always a living analysis of experience, an account of the experimental possession at every step of analysis, as much at the natural level as it is at the level of transcendence; and Tantra is exactly that—a sort of phenomenology enlivening reality". S.C. Banerji (1978)[210] made an important work setting forth, for the

[207] *History of the Śākta Religion*, New Delhi, 1974.

[208] *Śakti Cult in Ancient India*, Varanasi, 1974.

[209] *Tantras: A General Study*, Calcutta, 1976. [210] *Tantra in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1978.

first time, a systematic account of the Tantras of Bengal. A twofold motive actuated the author to undertake the work. The first was that the Bengali Tantra did not receive as much attention of the scholars as it deserved. And the second reason was to see to what extent Tantra influenced the life of the Bengalees. In the first chapter there was a general survey of the Tantra literature. The second dealt with the geography of Bengal, the third with political and social setting and the fourth with the works of Bengal on Buddhist and Hindu Tantras. In the fifth chapter, the highlights on Bengal Tantra were described. The sixth dealt with Kālī, the seventh with Durgā and her worship, the eighth with *varṇāśrama-dharma* and *ācāras* and the ninth with the philosophy and theology of the Bengal Tantras. The concluding chapter sought to give an idea of the deep and wide influence of Tantra on the life and literature of Bengal. The appendices dealt with the unpublished Tantras, Tantric influence on the Smṛtis, Tantras mentioned in the works of Bengal Vaiṣṇavism, works and authors mentioned in Bengal Tantras and a glossary of common technical terms. It has indeed been a very useful work for scholars.

In 1980 Subhendugopal Bagchi published an interdisciplinary study on the background of three important Śākta centres of eastern India—Kalighāṭa, Vakreśvara and Kāmākhyā.[211] In 1981 was published T. Goudrian and Sanjukta Gupta's descriptive and analytical *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*.[212] In 1982, R. Nagaswami published an important work on south Indian Tantrism which contained, besides a learned introduction, chapters on Tantra in Tamil classical literature, Tantra in Tamil devotional literature, Tantra in Tamil Sanskrit works, Śilpa texts bearing on the Tantric tradition, Tantra in monumental art and Śakti worship as gleaned from epigraphy.[213] The present writer's work on Tantrism[214] also appeared in the same year. It presented, in historical outline, the genesis, development and structural analysis of the Tantric tradition in India and its place in the Indian religious and philosophical systems. It studied the different aspects of Tantrism, its vastness

[211] *Eminent Śākta Centres in Eastern India*, Calcutta, 1980.

[212] Vol. 2, fasc. 2 of *A History of Indian Literature*, edited by J. Gonda, Wiesbaden, 1981.

[213] *Tantric Cult of South India*, Delhi, 1982.

[214] *History of Tantric Religion*, New Delhi, 1982.

and intricacies, its heterogeneous and contradictory elements and gave a historical perspective to the conglomeration of ideas and practices through space and time. After an introduction to the meaning of Tantra, the work outlined the various texts which comprised Tantric literature. The development of Tantrism was traced from the primitive times through the Vedic, post-Vedic, early Buddhist and Jain periods down to the evolution of the concept of Śakti in Indian religious thinking. The sequence is carried forward by a study of the development of Tantric Buddhism in India and Tantric ideas and practices in medieval religious systems. The Lokāyata tradition and its connection with Tantrism and finally the emergence of sophisticated Tantras with Śākta orientation completed this historical study of Tantrism through the ages. This composite work also incorporated a review on Tantric art and a glossary of Tantric technical terms with reference of texts and commentaries.

Among other important publications of the 1980s on Śāktism and Tantrism mention should be made of Diana Eek's 'Śiva and Śakti in the Land of India' (1982),[215] James Preston's edited volume on the Mother Worship (1982),[216] David Kinsley's 'Blood and Death Out of Place: Reflections on the Goddess Kālī' (1982),[217] M. Cheever Brown's 'Kālī, The Mad Mother' (1983),[218] O.P. Misra's *Mother Goddess in Central India* (1985), J.N. Tiwari's *Goddess Cults in Ancient India* (1985), and Thomas Coburn's work on the Devīmāhātmya section of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (1985).[219] Shubhangana Atre's *The Archetypal Mother* (Pune, 1987) was a new approach to the study of Harappan religion in which she said that the deity which was formerly taken to be as the 'Lord of the Beasts' was in reality the 'Lady of the Beasts,' that the Harappan goddess revealed both human and animal features as was attested by the ubiquitous unicorn, that the Vestal fires were a regular feature of

[215] *Larrabee Lectures on Religion*, Kenyon College, 1982.

[216] *Mother Worship: Themes and Variations*, Chapel Hill, 1982.

[217] *The Divine Consort: Rādhā and the Goddesses of India*, ed. by J.S. Hawley and D. Wulff, Berkeley, 1982. See also his 'Freedom from Death in the worship of Kālī' in *Numen*, XXII (3) and 'Kali' in *Hindu Goddesses: Visions of the Divine Feminine in the Hindu Religious Tradition*, Berkeley, 1986.

[218] *The Book of the Goddess Past and Present: An Introduction to Her Religion*, ed. by Carl Olson, New York, 1983.

[219] *The Devīmāhātmya: The Crystallization of the Goddess Tradition*, Delhi, 1985.

Harappan life in connection with the Mother goddess cult and that virgin sacrifice and allied rituals must have played an important role in the religious life of the Harappans. M. Basu, whose general introduction to the Tantra had already been referred to published in 1986 a masterly volume on the philosophy of Tantra.[220] This aspect was previously dealt with by many scholars but a complete and comprehensive treatment was lacking. Gopinath Kaviraja's contribution to this field was immense, but he preferred to penetrate more of the *sādhanā* aspects, that is, the principles of spiritual exercise and conceptualisations in regard to cosmogony. Basu's work began with historical restrospect which was followed by chapters dealing elaborately with the questions of ontology, epistemology, critique of experience, spiritual exercise, mysticism and liberation. The concluding chapters dealt respectively with Tantra and the spirit of the age and the different forms of yoga. B. Bhattacharyya[221] also dealt with the ritualistic, symbolic and philosophical intricacies of the Tantras from the viewpoint of his personal experience. The third monumental work published in 1988 on Tantrism was by S.C. Banerji[222] whose earlier work on the Tantras of Bengal we had already the occasion to refer. After C. Cakravarti, Banerji happened to be the only scholar who worked entirely on the basis of the original sources and had the opportunity and competence to handle numerous unpublished manuscripts. As a result, the work had not only provided a comprehensive account of Tantric literature in historical sequence but reflected at the same time the insight of the author caused by his constant association with various Tantric texts for a period of about half a century.

VI

In the concluding portion of the present chapter we shall deal with some important works pertaining to the minor religious systems. We begin with the cult of Brahmā which has been dealt with in most religious handbooks mentioned in the sixth chapter of the present work. Brahmā emerged as a creator god in the post-Vedic period having assimilated within himself the earlier Vedic cosmogonic principles such as Prajāpati, Hiraṇyagarbha, etc. and his name also used to denote the concept of the ultimate reality in the Upaniṣads.

[220] *Fundamentals of Tantric Philosophy*, Calcutta, 1986.

[221] *The World of Tantra*, New Delhi, 1988.

[222] *A Brief History of the Tantric Literature*, Calcutta, 1988.

Despite his cosmic background and his frequent reference in the Purāṇas as an important divinity, the grandfather (*pitāmaha*) of the gods, the cult of Brahmā could not be very popular among the masses. Sufficient scholarly attention was not also paid to his cult. Since he formed a constituent in the Hindu trinity as the principle of creation along with Viṣṇu and Śiva, the preserving and destroying principles, some scholars took notice of his cult in connection with iconographic studies. The first important work on the cult of Brahmā was made by T.P. Bhattacharya in 1957.[223] The author held that the Pāñcarātra cult was originally the worship of the five elements and that, in a later age, before it went under the influence of Vaiṣṇavism, the Pāñcarātra was characterised as the five forms of Brahmā cult. The word *rātra* originally indicated limbs or forms or elements and as such it became primarily a feature of the cult of Brahmā and was subsequently extended to other creeds. According to the author, the *Mahābhārata* was originally a treatise on Brahmā; Saptarātra is clearly understood from the Śāntiparvan references to the incarnations of Brahmā and this is substantiated by the evidence furnished by the *Bhagavadgītā*. The *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* and the *Manusmṛti* also refer to the Saptarātra cult of Brahmā. The author dealt with the antiquity and method of the worship of Brahmā with special reference to other gods related to the Brahmā sect and the influence of Brahmā worship on other cults. This portion was significant and valuable from the viewpoint of textual documentation. In the third and fourth chapters, the cult of Brahmā was brought in relation to Jainism and Buddhism respectively and many side-issues were also raised, while in the concluding chapter the origin of Buddhist art was traced to Brahmā's symbols. The next important work on the cult of Brahmā was made by Md. Israil Khan (1981)[224] on the basis of the Purāṇas in which he dealt with the legends pertaining to the birth and death of Brahmā, his offsprings, the Puranic episode, colour and vehicle of Brahmā and the image of Brahmā and his spouse along with an appendix on the names, attributes and epithets of Brahmā and 38 photo-plates. He suggested many explanations as to why Brahmā being the foremost of the Puranic triad, could not gain popularity.

[223] *The Cult of Brahmā*, Calcutta, 1957; second revised ed., Varanasi, 1969.

[224] *Brahmā in the Purāṇas*, Ghaziabad, 1981; *Some Graphic Puranic Texts on Brahmā*, Ghaziabad, 1979.

Sarasvatī, the spouse of Brahmā, was also a composite deity. Her name appears as that of a river in the *Ṛgveda*, but her present conception as the goddess of learning and fine arts had its origin in the Vedic conception of the goddess Vāk, the Buddhist Prajñāpāramita, Vajrasarasvatī, Vajravīṇāsarasvatī, Vajraśāradā and Mahāsarasvatī, the Puranic Sarasvatī and Mahā Sarasvatī and the Jain Vidyā and Sruta Devīs. Edward Foore (1810) equated Sarasvatī with Minerva Musica. V. Kennedy (1831) tried to give a comprehensive shape of the Puranic legends relating to Sarasvatī mainly on the basis of *Matsya, Varāha* and *Skanda* Purāṇas. J. Muir (1855 ff.) presented a descriptive account of the goddess, both as a river and as a deity mostly on the basis of the Vedic sources. Among others, earlier scholars who studied Sarasvatī in her different aspects mention may be made of W.J. Wilkins (1882), C.F. Oldham (1893), A.A. Macdonell (1897), and E.W. Hopkins (1915).[225] Iconographic studies on Sarasvatī was initiated by T.A. Gopinatha Rao (1914, 1916) which was followed by O.C. Gangoly (1914), N.K. Bhattasali (1928), Stella Kramrisch, R.D. Banerji, B. Sahai, J.N. Banerjea and others. Iconographic studies on the Buddhist Sarasvatī were made by Alice Getty, B.T. Bhattacharyya and S.K. Saraswati and on Jain Sarasvati especially by B.C. Bhattacharyya and U.P. Shah.[226] One of the most important contribution to the cult of Sarasvatī was made by A.C. Vidyabhusana (1933) in whose work all necessary informations in regard to the nature of worship of Sarasvatī prevalent among the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains, the myths and legends pertaining to this goddess as found in the Vedic epic and Puranic texts, various Sarasvatī images found in and outside India were collected and discussed at length.[227] But this important work was not made in any historical perspective and the author did not care to construct any chronological sequence. H. Bhattacharyya's paper on Sarasvatī (1934) was a study in relation to her cult on the basis of the Vedic and Puranic sources.[228] Among

[225]Names of the works of these authors (dates given within bracket) are to be found in chapter six of the present work.

[226]Their works are all mentioned in the next chapter which deals with iconographical studies.

[227]*Sarasvati*, in Bengali, 1340 BC, Calcutta, 1933.

[228]*K.B. Pathak Commemoration Volume*, BORI, Poona, 1934. Cf. A.S. Gupta, 'Conception of Sarasvatī in the Purāṇas' in *Purāṇa*, IV, 1962, 55–95; G.V. Davane, 'The Goddess Sarasvatī in Sanskrit Literature' in *Jour. Univ. Bombay*, XXXVII, 1968, 70–77.

recent studies on Sarasvatī mention should be made of the w Md. Israil Khan (1978)[229] and K.L. Bhattacharyya (1983).[230] ork the former was thoroughly based on literary material by me Wh which various facts and legends pertaining to this goddess ans made subject to critical analysis and historical reconstructio wo latter was predominantly an iconographical study which dea n, t besides an introduction and concluding remarks, the posit t wi the goddess in the Vedic, epic and Puranic literature as wel on the Jain and Buddhist pantheon and iconographical inform l as both from the texts and from study of actual images. iati

The cult of the goddess Lakṣmī was discussed in most pertaining to Vaiṣṇavism and in works dealing with the cult wor Female Principle and also with iconography, but individual of t graphs on this goddess are few in number.[231] Gerda Hart-m non 1933 wrote a treatise on Lakṣmī under the title *Beitra* inn *Geschichte der Gottin Lakṣmī* in which she had discussed the or ge the divinity, different Puranic myths related to her and her r gin to other deities. Sanjukta Gupta edited and translated into E lati the *Lakṣmītantra* (Leiden, 1971) which was basically a trea ngli Tantric ideas and practices having very little to do with the ise tional popular Lakṣmī. The most comprehensive work on t tra of Lakṣmī was, however, made in 1978 by U.N. Dhal[232] who e c the origin of the concepts of Śrī and Lakṣmī and their g race development into two divinities in the Vedic literature; o ner the distinct features of these two divinities as found in the Śr line supplement of the *Ṛgveda* and also in the Purāṇa-pañcal Sūk texts; systematised the materials pertaining to Lakṣmī in the kṣa Puranic legends; and dealt with the counter-concept of A epic and other allied features. The growing importance of La kṣn the Pāñcarātra sect was examined by way of comparison and mī anal

[229]*Sarasvatī in Sanskrit Literature*, Ghaziabad, 1978.

[230]*Sarasvati*, Calcutta, 1983.

[231]A.K. Coomaraswamy, 'Śrī Lakṣmī' in *Eastern Art*, I, 1929, 175–89; C. S murti, 'Goddess Lakṣmī and her Symbols' in *JUPHS*, XIV, 1941, 21–24; N. aran dhuri, 'Goddess Lakṣmī in the Purāṇa and Tantra', *The Poona Orientalist*, X Cha 1–6; V.S. Agarwala, 'Lakṣmī-Vidambanam' in *J.N. Banerjea Volume*, Calcutta 1 , 194 89; V.M. Bedekar, 'The Legend of Churning of the Ocean' in *Purāṇa*, IX, 19 0, 17 G.C. Ray, *Prācīna Bhārat mein Lakṣmī Pratimā: Eka Adhyayana*, Varanasi, 1968; , 7–6 car ed., *Foreigners in Ancient India and Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in Art and Liter* C. S cutta, 1970. r, C

[232]*Goddess Lakṣmī: Origin and Development*, New Delhi, 1978.

sis. Festivities associated with religious performances in honour of the divinity were also described.

The Sun-cult in ancient India, and specially in the Vedic age in its Indo-European and Indo-Iranian background, was taken into account by most Vedic scholars. For example, J. Muir discussed the nature and personality of many solar gods—Sūrya, Savitṛ, Pūṣaṇa, Viṣṇu, etc.—on the basis of Vedic literature and compared them with their Indo-European and Indo-Iranian counterparts. The works of Max Müller, Oldenberg, Pischel and Geldner, Hillebrandt, Macdonell, Bloomfield, Barth, Hopkins and others successfully brought forth, *inter alia*, the nature and personality traits of the sun-gods by a critical examination of solar myths and legends preserved in the Vedic literature and also by the philological analysis of the hymns of the *Ṛgveda*.[233] Sir R.G. Bhandarkar in his *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism and Minor Religious Systems* (1913) made a brief, but systematic, survey of the Sun-cult as a whole on the combined testimony of the Vedic, Epic and Puranic evidences and emphasised the role of the Iranian Magi priests in the evolution of the north Indian sun-worship. In W.T. Olcott's *Sun-lore of all Ages* (New York, 1914) the legends, traditions and superstitions woven round the sun among various peoples were collected. Hopkins in his *Epic Mythology* (1915) showed that besides the Vedic literature the epics also contain many important sources of the Sun-cult. T.A. Gopinatha Rao for the first time enumerated various forms of the images of the Ādityas and the Navagrahas in his *Elements of Hindu Iconography* (1914–16). The study of solar iconography caught attention of scholars soon after the publication of Rao's work.[234] In J.N. Farquhar's *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India* (1920) a good account of the Saura literature was provided as a convenient background for the study of the Sun-cult. S.K. Hodivala's *Indo-Iranian Religion* (1925) dealt with the Indo-Iranian counterparts of the Indian sun-gods. J.G. Frazer's *Worship of Nature* (1926) included a chapter on sun-worship of the Vedic Indians. Subsequently scholarly attention was paid mostly on the sun temples and images, details of which will be dealt with in

[233]Their works are mentioned in chapter II.

[234]H. Krishna Sastri, *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*, Madras, 1916. Such general works on art as those of Smith, Havell, Coomaraswamy, R.D. Banerji, B.C. Bhattacharyya and others and museum-catalogues prepared by J.Ph. Vogel, N.K. Bhattasali, V.S. Agrawal, Spooner and Hargreaves, etc. contained descriptions of sun temples and images. See the chapter on iconography.

the next chapter. A few notable articles discussing sun-worship on the basis of literary sources were published during 1925–35 by T.C. Das, R.N. Saha, Yamunacara and C. Venkatacarya in the proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference.[235] V.M. Apte's *Social and Religious Life in the Gṛhyasūtras*.(1939) discussed the role of the Sun-god in the domestic rites of the Hindus while P.V. Kane's *History of Dharmaśāstra* (II, 1941) brought forth the Smṛti materials on Sun-cult and also described in brief the role of the Sun-god in various domestic rites. Atkin's *Pūṣaṇa in the Ṛgveda* (1941) revealed the solar nature of Pūṣaṇa. N. Chaudhuri (1941) emphasised the folk aspect of the Sun-cult[236] while R.C. Hazra (1942) dealt with some important sites of sun-worship.[237] Hazra also contributed a number of articles on the Puranic sources of sun-worship. He tried to show that the *Śāmba Purāṇa* was a Saura work by different hands.[238]

D.R. Patil (1946) dealt with the sectarian sun-worship as found in the *Vāyu Purāṇa*.[239] D.K. Biswas (1948) took up the problem of the combined worship of Sūrya and Śiva where he emphasised the syncretic aspect of Sun-cult particularly in respect of Śiva-worship and substantiated his thesis by taking recourse to an Indo-Javanese text.[240] In an article entitled 'Two Solar Legends Re-examined' (1952) he discussed the themes of the *chatra* and boots of sun-images on the basis of literary references.[241] A systematic history of the sun-worship was supplied by H.D. Bhattacharyya in the second, third and fourth volumes of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Series (1953–55). Various aspects of the Vedic sun were dealt with by such authorities as Louis Renou,[242] P.E. Dumont,[243] A.K. Coomaraswamy,[244] N.J. Shende,[245] and F.W. Karmbelkar.[246] Study on Sun-

[235]Vols. II, V, VIII.

[236]*Man in India*, XXI, 1941.

[237]*Bhāratiya Vidyā*, IV, 1942.

[238]*ABORI*, XIX, XXI; *Journal of the Asiatic Society, Letters*, XVIII (2); *Studies in the Upa-Purāṇas*, I, Calcutta, 1958.

[239]*Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāṇa*, Poona, 1946.

[240]*IHQ*, 1948.

[241]*OHRJ*, I, 1952, 24–30.

[242]*Vedic India*, Calcutta, 1957.

[243]*JAOS*, LIII.

[244]Ibid., *JAOS*, IX.

[245]*Foundation of Atharvanic Religion* (BDCRI, IX); *Religion and Philosophy of the Atharvaveda*, Nagpur, 1952.

[246]*Atharvavedic Civilization*, Nagpur, 1959.

cult was made by S.K. De (1959) on the basis of the Epic literature.[247] In one of his articles entitled 'Bhāgavatism and Sun-worship' he opposed the view of Grierson and Raychaudhuri that Bhāgavatism was a direct development of sun-worship.[248] The early Puranic materials of sun-worship were studied by S.N. Rai in his Hindi work entitled *Purāṇic Dharma evaṃ Samāja* (1968).[249] V.S. Agrawal's *Solar Symbolism of Boar* (1966) discussed the solar elements in the boar incarnation of Viṣṇu on the basis of the Vedic and Puranic literature.

In 1972 was published V.C. Srivastava's *Sun-Worship in Ancient India* in which the history of the Sun-cult in India was treated for the first time right from its faint beginning in the proto-historic period to its maturity in the early medieval period on the combined bases of Brahmanical sources, secular literature, inscriptions, iconography, coins, temples and practices of indigenous tribes. It began with a sort of stock-taking of the works done on the subject in the past. The second chapter gave an account of the various symbols and forms of sun-worship in prehistoric and proto-historic cultures of India with the suggestion that it was historically not correct to begin the story of sun-worship from the Ṛgvedic period. The third dealt with the Vedic tradition of sun-worship on the basis of Vedic literature supported by the *Avesta* and Indo-European and Indo-Iranian mythology. It was suggested that there existed a class of saints who were particularly devoted to sun-worship, and probably this devotion was a family heritage to them. This feature became quite marked in the later Vedic age. The fourth discussed the origin, antiquity and nature of the Sun-sect along with the features and qualities of the Sun-god in the epics. The epic sun-worship foreshadowed the Puranic trends and thus served as a link between the Vedic tradition and the Puranic world. This was demonstrated in the fifth chapter. The problem of the antiquity, nature and extent of influence of the Magas which was one of the much debated questions of Indology was also discussed here. The sixth chapter dealt with the representations of Sūrya in ancient Indian art, and also the material remains of the Sun-cult. The seventh presented an historical survey of the origin and development of sun-worship in relation to time, tradition and space. In an appendix epigraphical materials in regard to the Sun-cult were presented to confirm and corroborate the data already gleaned from literary sources.

[247] *Aspects of Sanskrit Literature*, Calcutta, 1959.

[248] *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, VI, 1069 ff.

[249] See also his 'Early Puranic Account of Sun and Solar Cult', *University of Allahabad Studies*, 1965.

The cult of Skanda-Kārttikeya was studied by the earlier historians of Indian religion on the basis of literary, epigraphical and numismatic evidences. Sir R.G. Bhandarkar tried to establish that various names of this god originally indicated different deities, the present form of Skanda-Kārttikeya being their amalgamation. Among modern authors dealing with the cult of this composite deity, P.K. Agrawala presented a comprehensive and systematic documentation of the literary and archaeological evidences up to the Gupta period.[250] A.K. Chatterjee's work also followed the same approach in which the Puranic sources were especially taken into account and holy places associated with his cult were described.[251] The present writer in his *Indian Mother Goddess* demonstrated the association of Skanda-Kārttikeya with primitive beliefs centering round the concepts of vegetation and fertility and also tried to explain why this god was especially worshipped by the prostitutes in some places of India. The cock motif and solar association of Skanda-Kārttikeya were discussed by D.K. Biswas,[252] while the mythology of his genesis from a bewildering variety of sources and relations was analysed by Sukumari Bhattacharji.[253] Ratna Navaratnam's book on Kārttikeya was based mostly on the literary sources of south India in which all the legends of Murugan, his heroic and sexual exploits along with the genesis and development of his conceptions and final amalgamation to his northern counterpart were taken into account.[254] Subsequently Kanchan Sinha took Skanda-Kārttikeya as subject of her research. She also dealt with the character and personality of Kārttikeya as found in the religious and non-religious literature of both the northern and southern parts of the country and in inscriptions together with his representation on coins, seals, stone-sculptures terracottas and

[250] *Skanda-Kārttikeya: A Study in the Origin and Development*, Varanasi, 1967. See also his 'Skanda in the Purāṇas and Classical Literature' in *Purāṇa*, VIII, 1966, 135–58.

[251] *The Cult of Skanda-Kārttikeya in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1970.

[252] *Journal of Ancient Indian History*, I, 9–16.

[253] *The Indian Theogony*, 180 ff.

[254] *Kārttikeya: The Divine Child*, Bombay, 1973. Cf. F.W. Clothey, *The Many Faces of Murugan*, The Hague, 1976–77; K. Zvelebil, *The Smile of Murugan*, Leiden, 1973.

bronzes, trying to correlate the textual description with various kinds of his representation in Indian art wherever it could be possible.[255] The non-Aryan element in the personality of Skanda-Kārttikeya were very ably demonstrated by P. Jash.[256]

The cult of Gaṇeśa or Gaṇapati as a popular deity and also as the supreme being of the Gāṇapatya sect was dealt with by all leading historians of Indian religion. As early as in 1831, Kennedy in his *Hindu Mythology*, collected various episodes relating to the birth of Gaṇeśa. In 1845 B. Stevenson made an analysis of the *Gaṇeśa Purāṇa*.[257] The popular character of Gaṇeśa was emphasised by William Crooke in 1896 who saw in him a Dravidian solar god.[258] The Dravidian and non-Aryan origin of Gaṇeśa was later stressed by S.K. Chatterji in his *Indo-Aryan and Hindi* (1942). MonierWilliams placed Gaṇeśa at the head of the tutelary village divinities (*grāmadevatās*) who guarded the household and controlled good and evil deeds. In 1898 M. Winternitz made a thorough study of various conceptions of Gaṇeśa as found in the *Mahābhārata*.[259] According to Sir R.G. Bhandarkar (1913), in the earlier texts numerous Gaṇapatis were described, and it was not until the late Gupta period that these Gaṇapatis, Gaṇeśvaras or Vināyakas did combine in a single deity.[260] A. Mitra in an interesting article on Gaṇapati, published in 1931–32, referred to a passage from Manu which instructed that those who performed the *gaṇayāga* should be expelled from the funeral feast. He also referred to another couplet which described Gaṇapati as the deity of the depressed classes.[261] Regarding the anomalies in regard to the story of Gaṇapati's birth, Foucher had commented that "the discrepancies of these tales, even more than their inconsistency, would be enough to prove that they had been invented as an after thought for the needs of the cause and by less than indifferent scholars".[262] There was a genuine difference of opinion among scholars about Gaṇeśa's connection with the Vedic religion. Gopinatha Rao identified him with the ce-

[255] *Kārttikeya in Indian Art and Literature*, Delhi, 1979.

[256] 'Some Aspects of Kārttikeya Worship' in *PIHC*, 1981, 163 ff.

[257] *JRAS*, VIII, 1845.

[258] *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, London, 1896, 287 ff.

[259] *JRAS*, 1898; cf. B.R. Sharma in *Bhāratīya Vidyā*, XXXV, 1–12.

[260] *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism*, etc. 147 ff.

[261] *Visvabharati Quarterly*, First series, VIII, 1931–32, 475ff.

[262] A. Getty, *Gaṇeśa*, XXI.

lestial *guru* Bṛhaspati himself. Getty said: "It is interesting to note that Bṛhaspati, an important god in *Ṛgveda*, is described as carrying the axe or 'golden hatchet', an attribute particularly ascribed to Gaṇeśa, and that he also was referred to as Gaṇapati". The first comprehensive work on the cult of Gaṇapati was done by Alice Getty whose *Gaṇeśa: A Monograph on the Elephant God* was published from Oxford in 1936. The first three chapters of this work dealt with the Indian cult of Gaṇeśa with details of his origin and various conceptions in Indian literature, iconographical forms as found in the Hindu texts and images and his representations in sculptors and paintings. The remaining four chapters dealt with the cult of Gaṇeśa and his sculptural representations as found in Nepal, Chinese Turkestan, Tibet, Burma, Siam, Indo-China, China and Japan. Subsequent studies on Gaṇeśa were mostly iconographical in nature.

A new dimension in the study on the cults and rituals of Gaṇapati was provided by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya in his *Lokāyata* (1959). In his own words: "There are many reasons because of which we have selected the story of Gaṇapati. It will give us some idea of the tribes of ancient India and it will also throw some light on the question of how the state might have emerged in ancient India on the ruins of tribal organisation. Further, it is not without interest from the philosophical angle either. For Gaṇapati was not always a god—at least not so in the modern sense of the term—nor was he always favourably looked at by the ancient myth-makers and law-givers. He became a god only eventually and the process which raised him to the status of a god was but an ideological reflection of the process which ushered in the state power and human relations based on the individual ownership of property. To put it rather schematically: just as the state-power emerged on the ruins of the pre-class primitive communism, so also the spiritualistic ideas emerged in the human consciousness on the ruins of primitive pre-spiritualistic ideology. Gaṇapati, indeed, leads us to presume that the nature of this pre-spiritualistic ideology was materialistic or at least proto-materialistic, that is, Lokāyata, in the sense in which we have understood it". Alain Daniélou in his *Hindu Polytheism* (London, 1964) was of opinion that the word *gaṇa* meant 'category' and as such *gaṇapati*, 'the ruler of all categories' could be identified with the divinity in its perceptible manifestation. H. Heras in his *The Problem of Gaṇapati* held that Gaṇeśa was a deity without a founda-

tion in the Veda. In the prehistoric age he had not the head of elephant. His face was the face of a beautiful youth. According to him, the appearance of the head of an elephant was due to his Nāga affiliation. He kept many characteristics of his supposed brother Skanda. In his elephantine form Ganeśa was not the son either of Śiva or of Pārvatī.

Coomaraswamy also held that Gaṇeśa "does not appear in iconography before the Gupta period", and, further, "the figure of Gaṇeśa appears suddenly and not rarely in the Gupta period".[263] Kane thought that "the well known characteristics of Gaṇeśa and his worship had become fixed before the fifth or sixth century of the Christian era".[264] Debiprasad traced the origin of his elephant head to the primitive clans whose totem was elephant. He also held that his vehicle *muṣika* or rat had also totemic affiliation. A few tribes of ancient India were known by the name of *muṣika*. "Like the elephants of ancient times, these rats, too, had evidently a totemic past; their name itself is a proof of that. In modern India, the rat is not at all an uncommon totem among the surviving tribes".[265] S.K. Gupta held that "it was the destroying habit of the rat that brought the animal in contact with Gaṇeśa, the Vighnarāja, and turned it into his mount. The rat or mouse was a constant problem in ancient times in villages, towns and in agricultural fields.... Therefore, it was considered to be a source of *vighna* (trouble). Hence the idea that rat is the *vāhana* of Gaṇeśa".[266] S.A. Dange tried to establish the relation of Gaṇeśa with the cult of the Mother Goddess. He held that *sindura* and red garments of Gaṇeśa and the dirt of his mother were nothing but mythical superimposition to indicate his birth from Mother Earth.[267] The symbolism of Gaṇeśa in Indian art was treated in detail by Asis Sen in his *Animal*

[263]But J.N. Banerjea in his *Development of Hindu Iconography* has argued that the reliefs depicting the elephant headed and pot-bellied god undoubtedly go back to the early Gupta age, if not earlier still. According to D.C. Sircar the antiquity of Ganeśa goes back to the third or fourth century BC, *Ep. Ind.*, XXXV, 46; *IHQ*, XIX, 14. Besides iconographical studies Banerjea has also dealt elaborately the historical aspects of the cult of Gaṇeśa in his other book *Pauranic and Tantric Religion*, Calcutta, 1966.

[264]*History of Dharmaśāstra*, II, 215.

[265]For various theories on the association of rat with Gaṇeśa see B.A. Gupta, 'Harvest Festivals in Honour of Gaurī and Gaṇeśa' in *Ind. Ant.*, XXXV, 1906, 63; Foucher in A. Getty's *Gaṇeśa*, Oxford, 1936, XXIII; H. Zimmer, *The Art of Indian Asia*, New York, 1955, I, 47.

[266]*Elephant in Indian Art and Culture*, New Delhi, 1983, 53f.

[267]S.A. Dange, 'Birth of Ganapati' in *Aruna-Bhāratī*, ed. B. Datta, 1–7.

Motifs in Ancient Indian Art, Calcutta, 1972. P.B. Courtright's *Gaṇeśa* (New York, 1985) is the latest comprehensive work on this god.

Among the primitive folk deities, described in the Jain texts as Vyantara *devatās*, the cult of Yakṣas formed an important feature in ancient Indian religious life. Studies on the cult of the Yakṣas and allied deities were mostly iconographical in nature.[268] T.A. Gopinatha Rao collected several texts descriptive of iconographic types of such deities. A thorough study of Yakṣa cult was made by Coomaraswamy who demonstrated how having originated from a pre-Vedic kernel this cult survived as the suppressed religion of the masses, how with the emergence of Jainism and Buddhism there was revival of its functional role in public life and how the earlier Buddha images were modelled after those of the Yakṣas. He also connected Yakṣa-worship with the Bhakti cults. "It is in fact a great error to assume that the term Bhāgavat applies only to Viṣṇu. The rise, or, as it would be better to say, the coming into prominence of the Bhakti cult in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era was not an isolated sectarian development, but a general tendency".[269] J.N. Banerjea (1956) wrote: "In fact, most, if not all, of these different groups are common to various early texts of India. The word *deva* (or *devatā*) in the Buddhist list is of special significance in this context, for it denotes the original character of many of these beings of which the Yakṣas and the Nāgas form the most important and interesting groups. These two along with the groups of the Gandharvas and the Apsarasas occupy also a prominent place in the Brahmanical Hindu mythology. Reference may be made in this connection to the first lines of the *mantra* recited by many Hindus in the *tarpaṇa* and *śrāddha* ceremonies when they offer water and other objects to the manes (*pitṛgaṇas*), mythical heroes like Rāma or Bhīṣma, the gods, the Yakṣas and others. These three lines contain the names of the orders of these Vyantara *devatās:* Devas, Yakṣas, Nāgas, Gandharvas, Apsarasas, Asuras, Sarpas, Suparṇas (Garuḍas), Trees (sacred ones), Jihmagas (a class of sacred reptiles), Khagas (sacred birds), Vidyādharas, Jalacaras (sacred acquatic animals), Ākāśagāmīs (Sādhyas and Siddhas), etc.".[270] V.S. Agrawala also made extensive study on the Yakṣa and allied cults.[271] In his own words: "Perhaps no

[268]*Yakṣas*, 2 vols., 1928, 1931.

[269]Ibid., 27.

[270]*DHI*, 336.

[271]*Prācīna Bhāratīya Lokadharma*, Varanasi; *Indian Art*, Varanasi, 1965.

other cult is as ancient and widespread and as deeply ingrained in the lives of the peoples as the Yakṣa cult. Even today each Indian village has a Yakṣa shrine under the name of Bir, and on enquiry it was found that Yakṣa-worship under different names is a living cult from Kashmir to Tamil land and from Assam to Saurashtra.... It is certain that the tradition of folk art had an independent style of greater vitality than even the court art of the Mauryan times. Also the stone images of Yakṣas may belong to the fourth-third centuries BC but iconographic idiom was of much greater antiquity, and rendered through the medium of clay, a feature surviving to our own times".[272]

Fergusson's *Tree and Serpent Worship* (London, 1868) which evoked much interest among the scholars and also provoked sharp criticism from different quarters-is still now regarded as a classic by the students of Indian religion. According to him, tree worship is one of the earliest forms of religion in India. "With all their poetry, and all their usefulness, we can hardly feel astonished that primitive races of mankind should have considered trees as the choicest gift of the gods to men and should have believed that their spirits still delighted to dwell among their branches or spoke oracles through the rustling of their leaves". While his views on tree-worship found a universal acceptance those on serpent worship were not favoured by the subsequent generation of scholars. According to Fergusson the Nāgas were not originally serpents but serpent worshippers—an aboriginal race of Turanian stock inhabiting northern India who were conquered by the warlike Aryans. He asserted that "any traces of serpent worship that may be found in the Vedas must either be interpolations of a later date or concessions to the superstitious subject races. Oldenberg reckoned the Nāgas to belong to that class of demoniacal beings which was best represented by the werewolves, tiger-men, swan-maidens, etc. Kern thought them to be essentially the water-spirits. Winternitz emphasized the many sided character of Indian snake worship from a more objective and less speculative viewpoint in his extensive article *Der Sarpabali* published in 1888. C.F. Oldham held that they were originally a people who claimed descent from the sun and had the hooded serpent for a totem.[273] Hopkins also inclined to explain the Nāgas on a euhemeristic basis. "Garuḍas and Tārkṣyas", said he, "may have conceivably been human chieftains of the western coast, though they scarcely present a strong claim to euhemeristic interpretation as do their natural foes, the Nāgas".[274] On the other hand Barth laid stress on the complicated character of Indian snake worship in which he distinguished (i) the direct adoration of the animal; (ii) a worship of the water-spirits, and (iii) conceptions like Vedic Ahi connected with the myth of storm and lightning.[275] J.Ph. Vogel made in 1926 a thorough study of the Nāgas in Hindu religion and art[276] without any special theoretical preoccupation in seven chapters: The Nāgas in the Great Epic; The Nāgas and the Buddha; The Nāgas in the Jātakas; The Nāgas in Fables and Fairy Tales; The Principal Nāgarājas; Water-Spirits of the Happy Valley; and The Nāgas as they survive in Worship and Legend. The worship of trees, serpents and other natural objects was subsequently studied by various scholars in connection with their researches on myths and legends, symbolism, art and sculpture, iconography and other aspects of religious life.

H. Zimmer's study of mythology and symbolism[277] threw significant light on the botanic and zoomorphic substrata of the socalled higher religions. Here we like to quote one of his observations in which he sought to explain a paradox of the Viṣṇu legends. "Viṣṇu is linked (like Nietzsche's Zarathustra) with both of the eternal antagonists. Śeṣa, the serpent Endless, representative of cosmic waters, who is the source of all water whatsoever, in his animal representation, but then so too is Garuḍa, the conquering principle, the snake's opponent. This is a paradox with reason; for Viṣṇu is the Absolute, the all containing Divine Essence. He comprises all dichotomies. The Absolute becomes differentiated in polarized manifestations, and through these the vital tensions of the world process are brought into existence and maintained." Zoomorphic symbols were also interpreted by Asis Sen[278] who suggested that animals which were originally associated with the archetypal Female Deity or "the Lady of the Beasts" as her fecundative sources brought within themselves two distinct divisions, one was to be associated with the newly appeared Male anthropomorphic and leaving the others to

[272] *Indian Art*, 114, 118.

[273] *The Sun and the Serpent*, London, 1905, 30 ff.

[274] *Epic Mythology*, 46.

[275] *The Religions of India*, 266–67.

[276] *Indian Serpent Lore*, London, 1926.

[277] *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization*, ed. by J. Campbell, New York, 1962.

[278] *Animal Motifs in Ancient Indian Art*, Calcutta, 1972.

the Female one. He had discussed the symbolism of Elephant, Gaṇeśa, Makara, Bull, Lion, Horse and Bird from the viewpoint of psychic behaviour, race, culture and geography. According to him the composite figures came either through optical illusion or through both conscious and unconscious efforts to infuse different elements into a single object. B.C. Sinha also worked on symbolism in relation to the ten *avatāras*, tree and serpent, Yakṣas, Śiva, Mother Goddess and Gaṇeśa and discussed the significance of lotus, *vedikā*, *pūrṇakumbha*, wheel *svastikā*, etc. commonly used as symbol.[279] We have already had the occasion to refer to S.K. Gupta's study of elephant (1983). Recently T. Kapur brought out a volume under the title *Symbolism of Hinduism* (Delhi, 1988).

Some recent important works pertaining to the socio-economic basis of Indian religion should be mentioned in this connection. Francois Houtart and Genevieve Limercinier (1983) made a laudable attempt to present important phases of the major Asiatic religious down to the modern times within the framework of a socio-economic perspective.[280] Such works may be thought provoking but not so convincing owing to gross generalizations which cannot be avoided when done in such a vast canvas of time and space. More successful in this respect—so far as the socio-economic view point is concerned—was R.N. Nandi who had taken into account the functional and institutional aspects of various systems, especially what these meant to different classes of peoples in diverse social and geographical set up within the framework of an economic system trying to arrest disintegration by means of regimentation.[281] Another work in socio-economic perspective was made by Vijay Nath (1987) on the gift system[282] which was based on a multi-disciplinary approach demonstrating the complex mechanics of the institution of *dāna* from the earliest period down to the Gupta age. In Nandi's said work on Deccan (1973), the distribution of temples and monasteries brought out fascinating details of mutual relationships of brahmanical and non-brahmanical religions. Before it Puspa

[279] *Hinduism and Symbol Worship*, Delhi, 1983. Sinha also published *Tree Worship in Ancient India and Serpent Worship in Ancient India*, both from Delhi in 1979.

[280] *The Great Asiatic Religions and their Social Functions*, Indian reprint, New Delhi, 1984.

[281] *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*, Delhi, 1973; *Social Roots of Religion in Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1986; 'Client, Ritual and Conflict in Early Brahmanical Order' in *Indian Historical Review*, VI, 1979–80, 64–118.

[282] *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India*, New Delhi, 1987.

Neogi[283] tried to associate land-grants with religious establishments. This type of association was subsequently established by S. Settar in his 'From Vaiṣṇavism to Śrī-Vaiṣṇavism: A Study of Śri-Vaiṣṇava Settlements of pre-Rāmānuja era'.[284] Especially in the south Indian context some works were done on the geographical distributions of cults and creeds. F. Hardy's *Viraha Bhakti* (1983), mentioned in an earlier chapter, meticulously presented the movements of the Āḻvārs. Among other works dealing with the importance of the geography of religion V. Kesavan's 'The Temple Base of the Bhakti Movement in South India',[285] M.G.S. Narayanan and V. Kesavan's 'Bhakti Movement in South India',[286] G.W. Spencer's 'The Sacred Geography of Tamil Saivite Hymns',[287] K. Zvelebil's *The Smile of Murugan* (Leiden, 1973), etc. deserve special mention. The study of holy places, the centres of pilgrimage, the sacred complexes was taken up by many scholars of the past. P.V. Kane in the fourth volume of his *History of Dharmaśāstra* had given a detailed list of the *tīrthas* as found in the ancient texts with their present locations. A new dimension to this branch of study was added by D.C. Sircar in his *The Śākta Pīṭhas*. Most writers who worked on specific deities did not fail to mention the holy places associated with them. Apart from the descriptive aspects of the places of pilgrimage, the legends, traditions and rituals associated with them, by which the earlier studies were mostly characterised, some recent works insisted on micro-studies of specific sites and temples, their material setting and role in society and economy besides architectural and iconographical details, macro-analysis at regional levels, ecological considerations, acculturation, social-tribal-caste background of the pilgrims and so forth.[288]

[283] *Brahmanical Settlements in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1966.

[284] In Ratan Parimoo ed., *Vaiṣṇavism in Indian Arts and Culture*, New Delhi, 1987.

[285] In K.M. Shrimali ed., *Essays in Indian Art, Religion and Society*, New Delhi, 1987, 151–59.

[286] In D.N. Jha ed., *Feudal Social Formation in Early India*, Delhi, 1987, 348–75.

[287] *Numen*, XVII, 1970, 232–44.

[288] Cf. L.P. Vidyarthi, *The Sacred Complex in Hindu Gaya*, Bombay, 1961; 'Thinking about Sacred City' in *Eastern Anthropologist*, XIII, no. 4; B.B. Goswami and S.G. Morab, 'Comparative Study of Sacred Complexes in India' in *Journal of Social Research*, XIII, 1970; S.M. Bhardwaj, *Hindu Places of Pilgrimage in India: A Study in Cultural Geography*, Berkeley, 1973; L.P. Vidyarthi and M. Jha, *Symposium on Sacred Complexes of India*, Ranchi, 1974; E.A. Mornis, *Pilgrimage in the Hindu Tradition: A Case Study of West Bengal*, Delhi, 1984; M. Jha, *Dimensions of Pilgrimage: An Anthropological Appraisal*, New Delhi, 1985.

CHAPTER 8

Iconographical and Terminological Studies

I

The study of iconography is inextricably blended with the study of religion. The word *icon* (Greek *eikon*) means a devotional image, a figure representing a deity or a saint, in painting, mosaic, sculpture, etc., which is specially meant for worship or which, in some way or other, is connected with the rituals pertaining to the worship of different divinities. Thus iconography is that branch of the history of art which is concerned with cult or devotional images. A proper understanding of iconography therefore enables one to be conversant about certain important aspects of religious life of different peoples. It is helpful not only for the purpose of identifying images, but also for that of dating the works of art, since religious groups and social milieux have characteristic propensities towards particular types of subject matter at different times. It also aims at the reconstruction of the history of traditional symbols in works of art and their interpretation. Apart from the study and interpretation of the characteristics of the principal icons and images proper, it seeks to explain the special features and significance of the figure-sculptures, frescoes or such other objects which are executed on different parts of the shrines mainly for decorative purpose. Thus in a broad sense iconography really signifies the interpretative aspects of the religious life of a country.

The origin of modern iconographical studies may be traced to the age of European Renaissance. Enthusiastic collectors such as Poggio Bracciolini, Flavio Bondo and others were able to create public interest in Graeco-Roman antiquities. Subsequently the range of this interest became widened which covered the whole area once embraced by the Roman empire. Numerous sculptural specimens pertaining to a variety of religious beliefs and practices were discovered which included deities from Egypt, Phrygia, Armenia, Syria and even Iran. When these came to be studied on the basis of the rediscovered works of the classical writers like Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Virgil, Ovid, Augustine, Tertullian, Apuleius, Arnobius, Lucian and others, who were well-acquainted with oriental mythologies, it was revealed that the Roman cults were saturated with oriental elements and that the iconic conception of Virgin Mary were based upon the figures and attributes of the Egyptian Isis and the Phrygian Cybele. This led to the foundation of the study of historical iconography in which stress was given to the historical conditions responsible for the development of the components by which the image of a deity was constituted. Christian iconography centred round the mythologies of Christ, Mary and important saints who were generally depicted in accordance with the traditional Byzantine or the Orthodox Greek formula.

The usefulness of iconic studies in the Indian context was first clearly understood by Edward Moor who in his *Hindu Pantheon*, published as early as in 1810, presented numerous pictures of a bewildering variety of Indian gods and goddesses, which he managed to get for his book done in ink-sketches by an artist friend of his. He stated categorically that for a basic understanding of the Indian divinities, the study of images was essentially necessary. Subsequently with the discovery of sites connected with Buddhism and also that of Buddhist images, need for a systematic study of Buddhist art and iconography became imperative. As early as in 1838, Ritter wrote on the colossus Buddha image found at Bamiyan, including the great Stūpas and coined the term 'Indo-Bactrian Art'. Alexander Cunningham wrote on Buddhist symbols in 1851[1] and in 1854 Sykes published his study on the miniature Caityas.[2] The sites specially selected for the purpose of studying Buddhist art were Sanchi, Sravasti, Rajgir, Amaravati, Bharhut, Bhilsa, Mathura, Jalalabad etc. and the main emphasis of this study was on the so-called Graeco-Buddhist school of Gandhara.[3]

Albert Grünwedel's *Buddhistische Kunst in Indien* which appeared in 1893 was the first standard work on Buddhist art.[4] Grünwedel

[1] *JRAS*, 1851, 71, 117; cf. Hodgson in ibid., 1861, 393 ff.; Sewell and Pincott in ibid., XIX, 238ff.; XXII, 299ff.; *Ind. Ant.*, VII, 176 ff.; XV, 61, 89, 217 ff.; Lillie, 'Saints and Trees', in *JRAS*, XIV, 218 ff.

[2] *JRAS*, 1854, 37 ff., 227 ff.

[3] For earlier works in this field see Beal in *JRAS*, N.S., V,164 ff.; Bloch in *JASB*, LXVII, 177–205; Cunningham's *Arch. Reports*, I, 11–13, III, 79ff.; Friedrich in *ZDMG*, XVIII, 1864; Fergusson in *JRAS*, III, 1868; Sewell, *Rep. on the Amaravati Tope*, 1877; Simpson in *Trans. Royal Inst. Br. Arch*, 1879–80, 34–67, etc.

[4] Eng. trans. under the title *Buddhist Art in India* was made by Agnes C. Gibson in 1901 and revised and enlarged by J. Burgess.

categorically held that Indian art was predominantly, if not exclusively, religious and as such the study of iconography was doubly important for religious and artistic understanding. The work had four sections, an elaborate introduction dealing with the totality of Indian history and tradition in relation to the art-conceptions, the second chapter with the early Indian style, the third with Gandhara sculptures and the fourth with the representations of the Buddhas and the Bodhisattvas. Among other earlier works pertaining to Buddhist iconography mention may be made of the important papers of G.A. Grierson,[5] G.W. Leitner,[6] R. Sewell,[7] V.A. Smith and W. Hoey,[8] L.A. Waddell[9] and others.[10] In 1903–04 J.Ph. Vogel made a study of the Buddhist sculptures found from the Benaras region from an iconographical point of view. He also made valuable contributions to the study of the Mathura school of sculpture and proved its distinctiveness from that of the Gandhara.[11]

Alfred Foucher's *Etude sur Iconographie de l'Inde* (in two parts published from Paris respectively in 1900 and 1905) was the first pioneering and standard work on Buddhist iconography. Foucher's curiosity was roused by a study of the miniatures appearing on such Buddhist manuscripts as the *Prajñāpāramitā*, and then he made a systematic attempt to identify the sculptures. For the purpose of recognising images he hunted out a number of *sādhanas* from the *Sādhanamālā* and he was surprised to find that the images tallied most remarkably with the descriptions given in the unpublished texts of Tantric manuscripts. Again, the images and

[5]'On a Stone Image of Buddha found at Rājagṛha' in *JASB*, LXXXIII (1), 35–38.

[6]'Graeco-Buddhist Sculptures' in *As. Quart.Rev.*, VII, 1894, 186–89; also see *Ind. Ant.*, II, 242 ff.

[7]'Early Buddhist Symbolism' in *JRAS*, N.S., XVIII, 364 ff.; 'Some Buddhist Bronzes and Relics' in *JRAS*, 1895, 617–62.

[8]'Ancient Buddhist Statuettes', in *JASB*, LXIV(1), 155–62.

[9]'Graeco-Buddhist Sculptures of Swat', in *As. Quart.Rev.*, 1896; 'Indian Buddhist Cult of Avalokita and Tārā' in *JARS*, 1894, 51–89.

[10]Cunningham, *Arch. Reports*; Smith, *JASB*, 1889, 107–98; 1892, 50–76; 1893, 84–87; H.H. Cole, *Graeco-Buddhist Sculptures from Yusufzai*, Calcutta, 1885; E.C. d'Alvialla, *Des influences classiques dans l'art de l'Inde*, Paris, 1897; J. Burgess in *Jour.Ind. Art and Industry*, VIII, 1900, nos. 62–63, 69; H. Hargreaves, *The Buddhist Story in Stone*, Calcutta, 1914; Marshall in *ASIAR*, 1907–08, 39ff.; 1912–13, 1ff.; 1914–15, 1ff.; 1915–16, 1ff.

[11]*ASIAR*, 1903–04, 212–26, 244ff.; 1906–07, 137ff.; 1909–10, 63ff. His *Catalogue of the Archaeological Museum at Mathura* was published from Allahabad in 1910 and *Le Sculpture de Mathura* from Paris and Brussels in 1930.

sculptures supplied interesting details such as were not available in the *sādhanas*. Thus the *sādhanas* and the images enlightened each other. The second volume embodied a critical, although partial, study of the *Sādhanamālā* and it was this book that first emphasised the necessity of referring to a *sādhana* in order to make or justify any single identification of a Buddhist image.[12] Foucher's work was followed by A. Getty's *Gods of Northern Buddhism* (1914) in which, apart from identification, the conceptual and mythological background of various Buddhist deities with reference to their historical origins and development and illustrations had been dealt with. The deities were selected from the Tibetan, Chinese and Japanese pantheon, but India was totally unrepresented.[13]

The first comprehensive work on Hindu Iconography was done by T.A. Gopinatha Rao.[14] In Rao's own words: "The rules arrived at by the Indian artists do not appear to be divergent from those evolved by the European artists, and if in Indian sculpture the results are not good in some instances it is the fault of the artists and not attributable to the guide books". Attempts were made in this work to systematise the floating mass of canons. The sources of iconography were sought in the number of Saṃhitās, Āgamas and Tantras associated with one or other of the principal Hindu sects. Gopinatha Rao mainly drew from the Kriyāpāda of the Pāñcarātra Vaikhānasāgama in order to explain the characteristics of the Vaiṣṇava images and utilised the relevant sections of such Śaiva Āgamas as *Suprabheda, Kāmikā, Kiraṇa* and *Aṃśumadbheda* for throwing light on Śaiva icons. While discussing the question of the universal

[12]Other Works of Foucher included 'L' art bouddhique dans L'Inde d'apares un liverre recent' in *Rev. du L'Hist. des relig.*, XXX, 319–71; *Catalogue des peintures Nepal, et Tibet, de la collection B.H. Hodgson*, Paris, 1897; 'Les scenes figurees; de la legende du Bouddha' in *Journal Asiatique*, V, 523 ff.; *The Beginnings of Buddhist Art*, London, 1918; *L'art bouddhique du Gandhara*, Paris,1905–18; *L'art Graeco-bouddhique du Gandhara*, Paris, 1923; etc.

[13]An earlier study on Tibetan and Mongolian deities was made by Grünwedel in his *Mythologie des Buddhismus in Tibet und der Mongolei* (1900). Coomaraswamy published a paper on Mahāyāna Buddhist images from Srilanka and Java in *JRAS*, 1909. South Indian Buddhist art and iconography were studied by Gopinatha Rao in his 'Buddhist Vestiges in Kanchipura' in *Ind. Ant.*, XLIV, 1915, 127 ff.; E.B. Havell's *Indian Sculpture and Painting*, London, 1908 also insisted on the usefulness of iconographical studies.

[14]*Elements of Hindu Iconography*, originally published in two volumes under the patronage of the Travancore state in 1914 and 1916 respectively.

and regional character of the texts in relation to the images discovered in various localities in India, Rao held that "from the uniformity observable everywhere throughout India in the arrangement, say, of the individual figures belonging to a subject, it is clear that the rules laid down in the Āgamas and Tantras have had a very general application" and that "the same rules having been obeyed everywhere in the matter of making images, it is no wonder that the same results have been produced by the artists belonging to all parts of the country in so far as the art is apt to be bound down by rules". If there was any difference it was, according to him, "only observable in the outline of the feature and the details of ornamentation". Rao collected a number of relevant texts associated with the Viṣṇu images under the title *Vaiṣṇavamūrtyantarāṇi*. That the most primitive aspect of Śiva-worship was phallic in character was demonstrated by Rao with many quotations from the Purāṇas and other texts as well as by his elaborate study of one of the earliest such emblems with the figure of Śiva carved on it discovered by him at Gudimallam near Renigunta in Andhra Pradesh. He had illustrated most of the *ugra* and *saumya* varieties of Śiva images, described three types of Candraśekhara-mūrtis on the basis of the *Aṃśumadbhedāgama* and other Śaiva Āgamas and illustrated them mostly with the help of medieval bronze and stone sculptures from southern India. He collected names of various forms of the Devī or Śakti and their iconographic descriptions from different Āgamas, but illustrated only a few of these forms by extant stone and bronze sculptures of the early and late medieval periods. He pointed out that some of the early medieval sculptors began to change the mode of depicting the Devī's fight with the demon and referred to the Mahabalipuram and Ellora panels as specimens illustrative of the changed mode. He described the special features of the sun images and summarised in a tabular form the description of the Dvādaśādityas as incorporated in the *Viśvakarmāśāstra*. Iconic descriptions of Brahmā were quoted from *Aṃśumadbhedāgama*, *Suprabhedāgama*, *Śilparatna*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Rūpamaṇḍana*. He collected a good many stories about the origin of Gaṇeśa from the Purāṇas and Āgamas and presented details of Śakti-or-Lakṣmī Gaṇeśa, Unmatta-Ucchiṣṭa and Heramba-Gaṇapati, etc. Under the title of Subrahmanya-mūrti-bhedaḥ he had dealt with various Kārttikeya images like those of Śaktidhara, Jñānaśakti-Subrahmanya, Skanda-Subrahmanya, Senāpati, Gajavāhana, Tārakāri, Senānī, Brahmaśāstā, Vallikalyāṇasundara, Bālasvāmī, Krauñcabhettā and a host of others. He referred to the textual descriptions of the two-, four- and many-armed varieties of Śrī Lakṣmī. In fact very few works could claim to be as full and comprehensive as this monumental work of Gopinatha Rao. But this *magnum opus* somehow lacked certain features like the non-utilisation of the earliest monumental and epigraphic materials or the numismatic and glyptic remains. The development of individual iconographic types was not seriously discussed by him. Most of the sculptures described by him were south Indian. The north, west and east were very inadequately represented. Iconoic developments of the pre-Kuṣāṇa and pre-Gupta periods were seldom discussed. But one should not forget that the main purpose of this work was to demonstrate sculptural parallels of textual description of icons, and not to reconstruct the history of Hindu iconography as a whole. It should also be pointed out that when he had undertaken the task of bringing out a pioneering work on Hindu iconography all necessary materials were not available to him. Numerous iconic types characterising the deities of various ranks which were brought to light by Rao's careful and critical handling of literary materials were later supplemented by sculptural discoveries from different parts of India. For any strange type which is difficult to identify one has still to resort to Rao's work.

J. Dubreuil's *Iconography of Southern India* (1914),[15] O.C. Gangoly's *South Indian Bronzes* (1915) and H.K. Sastri's *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses* (1916) supplemented many of Rao's textual findings pertaining to the iconic descriptions of various deities by sculptural finds. These works suggested that the *śayana* or recumbent form of Viṣṇu was more popular in south India in which the god was represented as lying on the folds of the serpent Ādiśeṣa with one or two of his consorts attending him, as also the incarnation forms. In the case of the Śiva images, apart from the *liṅgodbhava-mūrtis*, there were varieties of anthropomorphic forms. Besides, there were the composite forms like Ardhanārīśvara, Dattātreya, etc. The *dakṣiṇā-mūrtis* of Śiva were principally south Indian in character. Yoga, Jñāna, Vyākhyāna, Vīṇādhara and other varieties of *dakṣiṇā-mūrtis* were seldom found in northern and east-

[15]English version 1937; translated by A.C. Martin; rep., 1978. It is also interesting to note that the Vedic scholar A.A. Macdonell was interested in iconographical studies. Reference may be made in this connection to his 'Early Hindu Iconography' in *JRAS*, 1907; 'Development of Early Hindu Iconography' in *Festschrift Windisch*; and 'History of Hindu Iconography' in *Rupam*, no. 4, 1920.

ern India. The *nṛtya-mūrtis* or dancing figures of Śiva contained a variety of poses such as *catura, kaṭisama, lalita, lalāṭatilaka, tālasaṃsphoṭika* and others. Tenets of southern Śaiva philosophy were conveyed in the Sadāśiva and Mahāsadāśiva images. In south Indian tradition besides Devasenā, Valli or Mahāvalli was the consort of Kārttikeya. She was sometimes shown as keeping company with the god in stone-reliefs and bronze sculptures. In the south Indian sun-images, the hand of the god had his hand raised to the level of his shoulder and the lotus held by him was only half-blossomed. His legs and feet were always left bare. On the other hand the north Indian images had generally their hands at the general level of the hips or elbows and were made to carry full blown lotuses rising up to the level of their shoulders and they wore boots. Aruṇa and the seven horses, almost invariably present in the north Indian varieties, were often absent in southern India. In fact, the difference between the northern and southern iconism was on the emphasis on certain types. Moreover, there was influence of local mythologies. Apart from all these, there was the element of indigenous or tribal deities that were subsequently identified with various deities of Puranic Hinduism though in their iconographical features the local elements could not be hushed up.

The first edition of B.T. Bhattacharyya's *Indian Buddhist Iconography* was published from Oxford in 1924, in which passages from the *Sādhanamālā* and the *Niṣpaṇṇayogāvalī* relating to the description of the deities of Vajrayāna Buddhism were quoted and translated into English along with illustrations from extant Indian, Tibetan and Chinese specimens and also from Nepalese drawings. It dealt with the images of the Dhyānī and Motal Buddhas; the Bodhisattvas; Mañjuśrī; Avalokiteśvara; emanations of Amitābha, Akṣobhya, Vairocaṇa, Amoghasiddhi, and Ratnasambhava; the gods and goddesses of direction; the Uṣṇīṣa gods; the protectresses; Tārās of various groups; gods associated with dance, musical instruments, door, light, etc.; animal faced deities, Ḍākinī group; philosophical deities; Hindu gods in Vajrayāna; the Dikpālas; the nine planets; the Balabhadras; the Yakṣas and the abstract deities. Despite certain limitations, it was one of the fundamental works on Buddhist iconography published so far from which subsequent scholars had heavily drawn.[16] In 1929 was

[16]The second enlarged edition of this work came out in 1958 by which time B.T. Bhattacharyya published his editions of the *Sādhanamālā* (1925–28) and the

published N.K. Bhattasali's *Iconography of Buddhist and Brahmanical Images in the Dacca Museum*. The flourishing period of the Bengal school of art ranged from the tenth century till the Muslim conquest, and many specimens of this schools are preserved in the museum of Calcutta, Dacca, Rajshahi and Malda. The Dacca museum contained various images of Tantric Buddhism. Particularly important among such images were those of some Dhyānī Buddhas, various forms of the Bodhisattvas Avalokiteśvara and Mañjuśrī, Tārā and other female deities, and some of them were very significant in regard to iconographical characteristics, because they were based upon uncommon forms of *sādhanas*. The same also held good in the case of certain Hindu images. Mention may be made in this connection to a Naṭarāja image which was made not on the basis of the existing canons but on a description found only in the *Matsyapurāṇa*. Bhattasali's credit lay in the fact that he was able to discover many hitherto unnoticed passages dealing with iconographic descriptions of deities from numerous texts of varied contents in order to make the correct identification of the images belonging to the Dacca Museum, in the collection of which he had also played a vital role.[17]

To the field of iconographical studies Ananda K. Coomaraswamy's contributions were not only pioneering but also remarkably profound.[18] His interest in the study of icons was revealed in his famous article 'The Dance of Śiva' which first appeared in the *Siddhānta Dīpikā* in 1912.[19] He was specially interested in the Naṭarāja (master-dancer) images of Śiva and tried to explain the symbolism of the Naṭarāja concept in terms of the fivefold activities of the God, viz. *sṛṣṭi* (creation), *sthiti* (preservation), *saṃhāra* (destruction), *anugraha* (grace) and *tirobhāva* (illusion). In his *Yakṣas* (1928, 1931) he tried to show how the iconography of the lower gods influenced the iconic types of the higher deities. "In early In-

Niṣpaṇṇayogāvalī (1949) on the basis of which he was able to revise the earlier version thoroughly. Apart from this, the publication of A.K. Coomaraswamy's *Elements of Buddhist Iconography*, 1935, the second edition of Alice Getty's *Gods of Northern Buddhism*, Oxford, 1928, Antoinette K. Gordon's *Iconography of Tibetan Lamaism*, New York, 1939 and Walter Eugene Clark's *Two Lamaistic Pantheons*, Cambridge, 1937 helped him immensely to rewrite various portions in the light of additional findings.

[17]Cf. R.D. Banerji, *Eastern School of Medieval Sculpture*, Delhi, 1933.

[18]See K.K. Dasgupta in *Ananda Coomaraswamy: A Centenary Volume*, Calcutta University, 1981, 54–68.

[19]First published in book form in 1920.

dian art, so far as cult images were concerned, one iconographic type stands out predominant, that is the standing figure with the right hand raised, the left hand on the hip ... of this type are the early images of Yakṣas and Yakṣīs, whether independent or attendant. And it is also this type which provided the model for cult images of other deities, such as Śiva or Buddha, when the necessities of *bhakti* determined the appearance of all deities in visible forms."[20] He also regarded the elephant-headed god Gaṇeśa as representing the Yakṣa type.[21] In his 'Early Indian Iconography'[22] he dealt with the iconography of Śrī-Lakṣmī and Indra. In his *Origin of the Buddha Image* (1927) he challenged the theory of the non-Indian origin of the Buddha image—a theory propounded by Ernst Curtius, Alexandar Cunningham, Albert Grünwedel, J. Fergusson, A. Foucher and others—and maintained that in content and spirit the Buddha image was very much Indian. The characteristic features of a Buddha image, according to him, were prevalent in early Indian art before the emergence of the Buddha image in the art of Gandhara and Mathura. He held that the standing Buddha was derived from the standing Yakṣa primitive of the type of Parkham, Patna and Deoriya whereas the seated Buddha had its prototype in the Yogī-like figures of the Bharhut reliefs as well as on similar effigies found on the earlier coins.[23] In his *Elements of Buddhist Iconography* Coomaraswamy analysed the well known symbols of Buddhist art and observed that all of them represented a universal religious symbolism and a set of theological concepts, that the Buddhist art in India began in the second century BC with a well developed set of symbols in its iconography and that these symbols could be traced back to the later Vedic Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas, if not to the *Ṛgveda*. In his own words: "The importance of these symbols, many of which have remained in use to the present day lies in the fact that they represent a definitely early Indian style amounting to an explicit iconography".

Part I of B.C. Bhattacharya's *Indian Images*, which was first published in 1921, dealt with Brahmanic Iconography, especially in the north Indian context because, according to him, Gopinatha Rao's

[20] *Yakṣas*, Washington, pt. I, 1928; pt. II, 1931, rep. 1971, 29.

[21] Ibid., I, 7.

[22] *Eastern Art*, I, 1929, 33ff., 125ff., 178ff.

[23] Cf. *Arts Bulletin*, IX, 1927; *JAOS*, 1926; *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, 1927; *Rupam*, 1929; *Bull. Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston, XXVII, 1929.

Hindu Iconography, O.C. Gangoly's *South Indian Bronzes* and Krishna Sastri's *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses* contained almost all the informations on south Indian images. The author had set forth in the 'Prologomena' the aims, principles and methods of his treatment of the subject. This portion comprised general remarks such as the purview of the subject, prevalence of images throughout India, north India and south India in respect of ancient sculptures, antiquarian places and museums, iconography and religion of India, minor faiths, classification of images, special treatment of an image, definition of cult-image, its necessity, antiquity of image worship and image worship in other ancient countries. The second part of the 'Prolegomena' dealt with the source materials. The first chapter contained iconography of the *trimūrti*, various types of Viṣṇu images including Vāsudeva, the recumbent Nārāyaṇa and the incarnations, Sūrya, Brahmā, Śiva in his various forms, Mahāsena or Skanda, Gaṇeśa, Agni, Varuṇa, Kuvera, Dikpālas, Kāma, Navagraha and Revanta; the second contained the iconography of the orthodox Hindu goddesses among whom were included Gaurī, Durgā, Lakṣmī Pṛthvī, Manasā, Kālī, Kṛśodarī, Cāmuṇḍā, Aṣṭamātṛkās, Sarasvatī, Gaṅgā, Yamunā and the Yoginīs; the third dealt with the *mudrās, āsanas*, symbols and dress. A genealogical table of the family of Brahmanical gods and goddesses was supplied besides an appendix dealing with supplementary texts on images. B.B. Vidyabinod's *Varieties of the Viṣṇu Image* (MASI, 1920) was one of the earliest iconographic studies on a single Hindu deity.

The study of Jain art and iconography was initiated by Fergusson in 1880 and it was followed by G. Bühler's 'Specimens of Jaina Sculptures from Mathura'[24] and Burgess's 'Digambara Jaina Iconography'[25]. D.R. Bhandarkar published two well documented articles on Jain iconography in 1905–06 and 1911 respectively.[26] V.A. Smith's *The Jaina Stūpa and other Antiquities of Mathura* (Allahabad, 1901) was not a work on iconography, but it created interest among scholars to work on Jaiñ sculptures of Mathura.[27] A.K. Coomaraswamy did not make any systematic study of Jain art

[24] *Ep.Ind.*, II, 311ff.

[25] *Ind.Ant.*, XXXII, 459 ff.; XXXIII, 330ff.; subsequently ed. with intro. by R.P. Hingorani, 1979.

[26] *ASIAR*, 1905–06; *Ind. Ant.*, LX, 125ff., 153ff.

[27] Cf. J.Ph. Vogel, 'Le Sculpture de Mathura', *Arts Asiatica*, XV.

and iconography. Still, his 'Notes on Jain Art',[28] 'Jain Sculpture',[29] 'The Conqueror's Life in Jain Painting',[30] and *Catalogue of Jain Paintings and Manuscripts* (Boston, 1924) were useful contributions to the study and understanding of Jain art and iconography. In the annual report of the Archaeological Survey of India (1925–26), R.P. Chanda published his *Jaina Remains at Rajgir* and *Jain Images*. Mention may be made in this connection to an important paper of H.M. Johnson which was published in 1927 in *Indian Antiquary* under the title 'Śvetāmbara Jaina Iconography'. In 1936 came out M.S. Nawal's *Jaina Citra Kalpadruma*. Important articles on Jain art were published in 1937 by K.P. Jayaswal,[31] and in 1938 by H.D. Sankalia.[32] But it was B.C. Bhattacharya's *Jaina Iconography* (Lahore, 1939) which might be regarded as the first authentic work on the subject, the worth of which has not even slightly diminished in subsequent years. Bhattacharyya was the first to collect published and unpublished manuscripts on Jain icons by means of an extensive field work. In his own words: "I freely sought the guidance of orthodox Jaina scholars who, though deeply learned in Jaina philosophy, were unable to adequately indicate the various texts relating to the Jaina images, scattered over their ritualistic literature. In order to find these, I took to exploring the different manuscript collections preserved in far distant places of our country. This involved me in visits to Arrah, Agra, Bikaner, Baroda, Ahmedabad, Rajkot and several other places where such literature was to be found." The introductory portion of this work dealt with the fundamentals of Jain religion, the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras, the concept of Tīrthaṃkaras, origin of Jain images, Jain temple worship, classes of Jain gods and goddesses, the main characteristics of Jain images, centres of Jain pilgrimage and age of image worship. Then the book went on to describe the iconographical features, as found in the textual descriptions and in the sculptural representations, of the twenty-four Tīrthaṃkaras, the Yakṣas and Śāsanadevatās, the Yakṣiṇīs, the Dikpālas, the Navagrahas, the Śrutadevīs and Vidyādevīs and miscellaneous Jain divinities like Hariṇegameṣī, Kṣetrapāla, Śrī or Lakṣmī, Śāntidevī, Yoginīs, etc. A separate chap-

[28] *Journal of Indian Art*, London, 1914, XVI, reprinted as *Jaina Art*, New Delhi, 1994.

[29] In *Bull. Mus. of Fine Arts*, 1922, 53.

[30] *JISOA*, III, 127–44.

[31] *JBORS*, XXIII, 1937.

[32] *JRAS*, 1938; *JISOA*, IX 1941; cf. U.P. Shah in *JUB*, X, 1941.

ter was devoted to the *āsanas* and *mudrās* and an appendix containing notes on the Jain symbols and technical terms, besides numerous plates illustrating the Tīrthaṃkaras and other Jain deities.

II

J.N. Banerjea's *Development of Hindu Iconography* which was first published in 1941 was the most important contribution to the study of Hindu iconography after the *magnum opus* of Gopinatha Rao. The earlier works of Krishna Sastri and Dubreuil dealt only with the south Indian images; Bhattasali's work with the special features of the Brahmanical sculptures found mostly in eastern Bengal; and B.C. Bhattacharya's work with north Indian Hindu images of the Gupta and post-Gupta periods. None of these works could claim to be as full and comprehensive as the monumental work of Rao. But, as we have pointed out above, Rao, no doubt, collected a number of very useful iconographic texts and reproduced numerous early and late medieval sculptures, mostly south Indian, to illustrate the same, but the development of the individual iconographic types had seldom been discussed by him. In order to show this development, according to Banerjea, it was not only necessary to study critically the extant reliefs and single sculptures of the Gupta, Kuṣāṇa, and pre-Kuṣāṇa periods, but a careful and systematic handling of the numismatic and glyptic remains of India of the same periods was also indispensable. When earlier sculptural types of gods and goddesses were not available, ancient Indian coin and seal devices could help remarkably in determining the mode of their representations in the remote past. In the first chapter of his book, after giving an idea about the subject itself, Banerjea thus indicated the lines in which the study of Hindu iconography should be conducted and the variety of materials handled in its scientific treatment. The second and third chapters contained elaborate discussions on the antiquity and origin of image worship in India. In the fourth and fifth chapters it was shown how the ancient Indian coins and seal impressions could help in ascertaining the early iconographic types of a number of Hindu divinities and their emblems. The sixth chapter discussed the technique of the iconoplastic art in India with the help of indigenous texts. In the seventh was explained various technical terms which were frequently to be found in the iconographical texts. In the eight and last chapter the Indian canons of iconometry were discussed. The second one of

the three appendices consisted of the re-edited version of a text called *Pratimāmānalakṣaṇam* with translation and notes. In the second edition of this book, which was published in 1956, a few more chapters were added. The Vyantara *devatās*, or folk divinities, were considered first, for, according to Banerjea, they were the divine entities centering round whom the primitive cults of *bhakti* first originated. He had included the iconographic types of Gaṇapati, Kārtikeya, Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī in this group for he held that these deities were originally recruited from the category of folk gods and goddesses. Various groups of icons associated with the major Brahmanical Hindu cults were discussed in the tenth and eleventh chapters in which their composite character was delineated. Icons of Brahmā and the Aṣṭadikpālas, as well as those of such accessories to the major cult deities, like Garuḍa, Nandin and the Āyudhapuruṣas, had been commented on, along with the characteristic traits of various groups of syncretistic icons, such as Harihara, Ardhanārīśvara, Viṣṇulokeśvara, Mārtaṇḍa-bhairava etc. Two selections of the appendix A of the first edition 'Image Worship and the Pāñcarātra' and 'Dhulicitra' had been incorporated in the sixth and tenth chapters of the second edition, while two new topics, 'The Ideology behind the Hindu Image' and 'Some Puranic Deities in the Vedic texts' were inserted. The order of the Appendix B of the previous edition was changed, giving precedence to chapter 57 of the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā*, the whole of which with its English translation and notes had been incorporated.[33]

In 1933 A.J. Barnet Kemper published from Leiden *The Bronzes of Nalanda and Hindu-Javanese Art* which was important for Buddhist iconographical studies. In 1934 K.P. Jayaswal wrote on the metal images of the Kurkihar hoard and tried to fix up the chronology of the images.[34] In 1940, A. Banerji Sastri wrote an excellent article under the title 'Ninety-three inscriptions on the Kurkihar bronzes' which had remained so long as the genuine source for the study of Kurkihar bronzes.[35] C. Sivaramamurti's *Amaravati Sculptures* (Madras Museum Bulletin, no. 4, 1942) was also very important for the study of Buddhist iconography. Since in Tantric Buddhism there was a variety of forms and conceptions of deities, a

[33]The chapters dealing with Viṣṇuite icons and those of Sūrya, incorporated in the second edition of the *DHI*, were previously published in *JISOA*, XIII, XIV, XVI.

[34]*JISOA*, II, 1934, 70–82.

[35]*JBORS*, XXVI, 1940, 236–51, 299–308.

good number of works on Buddhist iconography banked on this phase of Buddhism. Among important specialised works in this field mention should be made of Marie T. de Mallmann's *Introduction a l'Etude d'Avalokiteśvara* which came out from Paris in 1948. Mention should also be made in this connection of important iconographical papers like B.T. Bhattacharyya's 'Iconography of Heruka',[36] E. Conze's Iconography of Prajñāpāramitā',[37] Debala Mitra's 'Tantric Buddhist deity Mahākāla',[38] 'Image of Sambara in Patna Museum',[39] and 'Jambhala-Maṇḍala in Sculpture',[40] M.F. Ward's 'The Lotus Symbol: Its Meaning in Buddhist Art and Philosophy',[41] B.N. Misra's 'Bodhisattva Images from Nalanda',[42] M. Lalou's 'Notes on Vajrapāṇi',[43] D. Barrett's 'Bronzes of N.W. India and W. Pakistan',[44] J.E. Van Lohuizen de Leeuw's 'The Pattikera Cundā and variations of Her Image',[45] J.J. Boele's 'The Buddhist Tutelary Couple Hārītī and Pañcika',[46] S. Chattopadhyaya's 'Buddhist Iconography and the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa',[47] R.L. Mehta's 'Amitābha Buddha Image from Chavaj',[48] etc. Among the books bearing on Buddhist iconography which came out during the period under review reference should be made to D. Barrett's *Sculptures from Amaravati in the British Museum* (1954), P.R. Ramachandra Rao's *Art of Nagarjunikonda* (1956), W. Kirfel's *Symbolik des Buddhismus* (1959), D.A. Sounders' *Mudrā: A Study of Symbolic Gestures* (1960), G. Tucci's *Theory and Practice of the Maṇḍala* (1961), M. Lurker's *Bibliographie zur Symbolkunde* (1964), D. Seckel's *Art of Buddhism* (1964, Eng. trans. by Ann E. Keep), J.E. Van Lohuizen de

[36]*Indian Culture*, II, no.1.

[37]*Oriental Art*, II, 1949, 47–52; III, 1951, 104–09.

[38]*IHQ*, XXXIV, 1955,1–5; 'Aṣṭamahābhaya Tārā' in *JAS*, XXXII, 1957.

[39]*OHRJ*, IX, 1960, 43–46.

[40]*JAS*, III, 1961, 38–41.

[41]*Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, XI, 1952.

[42]*JUPHS*, I, 1953.

[43]*Adyar Library Bulletin*, XX, 1956; XXV, 1961.

[44]*Lalit Kalā*, no.11, 1962, 35–44.

[45]*N.K. Bhattasali Commemoration Volume*, Dacca, 1966, 119–43.

[46]*Journal of the Siam Society*, LVI, 1968.

[47]*Journal of the Dept. of Humanities*, Burdwan University, I, 1968.

[48]*Journal of the Oriental Institute*, XX, 1970.

Leeuw's *Indian Sculptures in the Vonder Heydt Collection* (1964),[49] Mallmann's *Etude Iconographique sur Mañjuśrī* (1964), R.S. Gupta's *The Iconography of the Buddhist Sculptures of Ellora* (1964), etc. Debala Mitra's *Buddhist Monuments* (1971) which gave an up to date comprehensive account of the Buddhist monuments scattered all over India was also valuable for iconographical studies in which the images found in various sites were perfectly described in terms of their iconographical features. D.C. Bhattacharyya's *Tantric Buddhist Iconographic Sources* (1974) dealt with iconographical contents of some unpublished manuscripts such as the *Abhidhānottara, Ādivāgvajratriratna, Cakrasaṃvara-sādhanā, Dharmakoṣa-saṃgraha, Ekallavīra-Candaroṣaṇatantra, Amoghapāśa-Lokeśvarapūjā,* etc. His 'Five Protrectress Goddesses of Buddhism' was published in 1972 in a volume on Indian art edited by Pratapaditya Pal.[50] Bhattacharyya's subsequent work *Studies in Buddhist Iconography* (1978) dealt with the iconography of Tārā, Prajñāpāramitā, Five Protective goddesses, *mudrās* and *āsanas*. S.K. Sarasvati's *Tantrayāna Art: An Album* (1977) contained illustrations of the images of the Buddha, the Bodhisattvas, and the emanated gods and goddesses found in stone and metal from different parts of the country with descriptive notes as introductory. It also illustrated a variety of paintings. It contained 70 colour plates. Arranged according to chronological periods and geographical areas, D.N. Snellgrove's edited volume, *The Image of Buddha* (1978), contributed by a panel of distinguished scholars, traced the gradual evolution of Buddhist iconography, introducing the earliest concepts of Buddha and documenting his aniconic and human forms, flowering of Buddhist art in India, appearance of Buddhist images in different Asian countries and his symbolic representations. Buddhist iconography was studied by the present author in *East Indian Bronzes* (1979) a collective effort of the Centre of Advanced Study in AIHC, Calcutta University, in which the iconic features of the Mortal Buddhas, Maitreya, Dhyānī Buddhas, Vajradhara-Vajrasattva, various forms of Avalokiteśvara and Mañjuśrī and deities like Hayagrīva, Heruka-Nairātmya-Hevajra, Sambara, Yamāntaka-Yamāri, Jambhala-Vasudhārā, Trailokyavijaya, Kurukullā, Bhṛkuṭi, Parṇaśabarī. Prajñāpāramitā, Aparājitā, Māricī, Cundā and various forms of Tārā were described with reference to textual and sculptural illustrations. Debala Mitra's *Bronzes from Achutarajapur* (1978) and *Bronzes from Bangladesh* (1980) were significant contributions to Mahayanic-Tantric Buddhist iconography. Mallar Ghosh's *Development of Buddhist Iconography in Eastern India* (1980) was also a study in the same line in which Tārā, the Prajñās of Five Tathāgatas and Bhṛkuṭi were taken into account. Ratan Parimoo's *Life of Buddha in Indian Sculpture* (1982) was an iconographical analysis in which the eight miracles, as depicted in the sculptural representations, were specially treated. Lokesh Chandra's *Buddhist Iconography* (1987), originally started by his illustrious father Dr. Raghuvira, was a study with copious illustrations of the iconography of Tibetan Buddhism.

[49]Buddhist art covers but a small part of the scope of the book, yet some Mathura, Amaravati and Gandhara sculptures as well as an image and fragments of Pāla art are well described in their iconographic specialities and artistic merits.

[50]*Aspects of Indian Art*, Leiden, 1972.

After the pioneering work of B.C. Bhattacharyya studies on Jain iconography had received a fresh vigour in the hands of U.P. Shah'[51] Moti Chandra[52] and K.D. Bajpai.[53] Among the other important articles on Jain iconography mention may be made of K.K. Gan-

[51]*Studies in Jaina Art*, Varanasi, 1955; *Akota Bronzes*, Bombay, 1959; 'Vardhamāna-Vidyā-Paṭa', 'Iconography of Sixteen Jaina Mahāvidyās', 'Hariṇagameśin', 'Jaina Metal Images from Surat', 'Jain Bronze from Jasalmir', 'Pañca Tīrthika Metal Image'—all in *JISOA*, VI, 52–67; XV, 114–77; XIX, 19–41, Spl. No. on Western Art, 1965–66, 3, 23–26; 'A Jaina Bronze in Virginia Museum' in *Oriental Art*, N.S., XVIII, 253–54; 'A Female Cauri-bearer from Ankottaka', 'Age of Differentiation of Digambara and Śvetāmbara Image and the Earliest Known Śvetāmbara Bronzes', 'An Early Image of Pārśvanātha', 'Bāhubali', 'Parents of the Jinas'—all in *Bulletin of the Prince of Wales Museum*, I. 34 ff., 43–46; III. 63 ff.; IV. 32 ff.; V. 24–32; 'A Unique Jaina Image of Jīvantasvāmī', 'A Few Early Sculptures from Gujarat' (with R.N. Mehta), 'Sidelights on the Life-time Sandalwood Image of Mahāvīra', 'Yakṣa worship in Early Jaina Literature', 'An Old Jaina Image from Khed-Brahma', 'Iconography of Cakreśvarī', 'Yakṣiṇī of the 24th Jina'—all in *JOI*, I, 72–79, 160 ff., 358–68; III, 55 ff.; X. 61–63; XX. 280–313; XXII, 70–78; XXX, 463 ff.; 'A Pārśvanātha Sculpture' in *Bull. Cleveland Museum*, 1970, 303–11; 'Beginnings of Jaina Iconography' in *Bull. Mus. and Arch., U.P.*, IX, 1–14; 'Brahma Santi and Kapardi Yaksa', in *Jour. M.S. Univ.*, VII, 59–72; 'Bronze Hoard from Vasantgadh' and 'Jain Bronzes from Cambay' in *Lalit Kalā*, I-II, 56–65; XIII, 31–34; 'Iconography of Ambikā and Sarasvatī' in *Jour. Univ. Bombay*, IX-X; 'Jain Iconography: A Brief Survey' in *Muni-Jinavijaya Abhinandana Grantha*, Jaipur, 1971, 184–218.

[52]*Jaina Miniature Paintings from Western India*, Ahmedabad, 1949; 'An Illustrated MS. of the Kalpasūtra and Kālakācāryakathā' in *Bulletin of the PW Museum*, IV, 40–48; 'Jain Bronzes from Western India' (with S. Gorakshkar) in ibid., XI, 13–25; 'Architectural Data in Jaina Canonical Literature' in *JUPHS*, XXII, 64–80. *Stone Sculptures in the Prince of Wales Museum*, Bombay, 1974.

[53]'New Jaina Images in the Mathura Museum' in *Jain Antiquary*, 1948; *JUPHS*, XIX; 'Jaina Image of Sarasvatī in the Lucknow Museum' in *Jain Art*, XI.4 ff.; 'Deogarh ki

guly's 'Jaina Images in Bengal'[54] and 'Some Symbolic Representations in Early Jaina Art',[55] M.P. Dash's 'Jaina Antiquities from Charampa (Orissa)',[56] H. Mode's 'The Study of Jaina Art',[57] S. Settar's 'Cakreśvarī in Karnataka Literature and Art',[58] R. Sengupta's 'The Jaina Āyāga-platforms at Mathura',[59] N. Ramesan's 'Jaina Bronzes from Bapatta',[60] V.N. Srivastava's 'Some Interesting Jaina Sculptures in Lucknow State Museum',[61] W.S. Hadaway's 'Notes on Two Jaina Images',[62] N.P. Joshi's 'Lucknow Museum Collection of Jaina Metal Images',[63] R.J. Del Bouta's 'An Image of Pārśvanātha from Varuṇa',[64] C.M. Atri's 'A Collection of Some Jain Stone Images from Mount Girnar',[65] P. Banerjee's 'A Note on Worship of Images in Jainism',[66] etc. In Hindi, besides K.D. Bajpai, B.M.S. Parmar worked on the Jain images belonging to the Bharatpur Museum[67] and A.C. Ṇahata studied the Jain Iconographical contents as found in the *Rūpamaṇḍana* and other Vāstuśāstras.[68] Adris Banerji's studies on Jain icons should also be mentioned in this connection.[69] Among other important contributions to Jain iconography mention may be made of the works of B.N. Sharma,[70] Niraj Jain (on Gwalior Museum Collection, on Rajghat images and

Jaina Prabhāvayen' and 'Madhya Pradesh ki Prachin Jaina Kala', in *Anekānta*, 1962, 1964.

[54] *Indian Culture*, VI.

[55] *Jaina Journal (JJ)*, I, 31–36.

[56] *Orissa Historical Research Journal*, XI, 50 ff.

[57] *JJ*, I, 7–12.

[58] *Oriental Art*, N.S., XVII, 63–69.

[59] *Bull. Mus. and Arch., U.P.*, IX, 23–29.

[60] *Lalit Kalā*, XIII, 28 ff.

[61] *Bull. Mus. and Arch., U.P.*, IX, 45 ff.

[62] *Rupam*, XVII, 48 ff.

[63] *Bull. Mus. and Arch., U.P.*, IX, 34 ff.

[64] *Oriental Art*, N.S., XVIII, 174 ff.

[65] *Bull. of the Museum and P.G.*, Baroda, XX, 51–59.

[66] *JBRS*, XXXVI, 57 ff.

[67] *Rajasthan Bhārati*, X, 15 ff.

[68] *Anekānta*, XIX, 294 ff.; XX, 207 ff.

[69] *IHQ*, XXV, 205 ff.; *JBRS*, XXVIII, 43 ff.; *Babu Chote Lal Jain Smriti Grantha*, Calcutta, 1967, 71 ff.

[70] 'An Image of Pārśvanātha from Rajasthan' in *The Researcher*, Jaipur, VII–IX, 31ff.; 'Some Interesting Temple Sculptures at Osian', *Rūpa Lekha*, New Delhi, XXXV,

on the Śāsanadevatās),[71] B.C. Jain (on Dhubela collection, bronzes from Rajnapur-Kinkini, Pratimā-lakṣaṇa, images of saints),[72] H.K. Prasad,[73] M.A. Dhaky,[74] M.N.P. Tiwari,[75] R.C. Sharma,[76] R.C. Agrawala (Jīvantasvāmī from Rajasthan, goddess Saccikā, icons from Jodhpur, Ambikā from Marwar),[77] etc. Jain icons from Bhagalpur were studied by A.K. Sinha[78] while those from Bengal were studied by Debala Mitra,[79] P.C. Dasgupta,[80] Sudhin De,[81] P.K. Mitra,[82] Bijan De[83] and the present author.[84] Among important monographs on this subject mention may be made of S.C. Upadhyaya's *Jain Iconography* (1969) which was based mostly on Śvetāmbara sources. Klaus Bruhn's *The Jina Images from Deogarh* (1969) was a regional study of Jain iconography. R.C. Gupta's *Iconography of the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains* (1972) contained relevant information on various aspects of Jain iconography. Gosta Liebert's *Iconographic Dictionary of the Indian Religions* served the same purpose in which aspects of Hindu, Buddhist and Jain iconography were treated with necessary details. Jose Pereira's *Monolithic Jinas* (1977) dealt with the iconography of the Jain temples on Ellora while R.P. Hingorani's *Jaina Iconography*

30ff.; 'Tri-Tīrthika of Pārśvanātha' in *Jour. Ind. Museum*, XXV–XXVI, 131ff.; 'Unpublished Jain Bronzes in the National Museum' in *JOI*, XIX, 275–78.

[71] *Anekānta*, XVI, 99–103, 214ff.; XIX. 49 ff.

[72] Ibid., XIX, 204–13; also in 1963 and 1966 issues; *Jour. Ind. Museums*, XI, 15–33.

[73] 'Jain Bronzes in the Patna Museum' in *Śrī Mahāvira Jaina Vidyālaya Golden Jubilee Volume*, Bombay, 1968, I, 275 ff.

[74] 'The Iconography of Sacciyā Devī' in *C.L. Jain Smṛti Grantha*, Calcutta, 1967, 63–70.

[75] *JJ*, VI, 41 ff., 122 ff.; VIII, 84 ff., *Anekānta*, XXIII–XXV; *Sambodhi*, 1973, 7–14; *Śramaṇa*, Varanasi, 1970, 18–23.

[76] 'The Early Phase of Jaina Iconography' in *C.L. Jain Smṛti Grantha*, 57–62; also *Anekānta*, 1966, 142 ff.

[77] *Brahma Vidyā*, Madras, XXII, 32 ff.; *Artibus Asiae*, XVIII, 232 ff.; *JBBRAS*, XXIX, 63 ff.; *Jaina Siddhānta Bhāskara*, XXI, 1 ff.; *Jaina Art*, XX, 15 ff.; *IHQ*, XXXII, 434 ff.

[78] *JJ*, XVII–XIX.

[79] 'Some Jain Antiquities from Bankura' in *JAS* (L) XXIV, 131 ff.; also Ch. in A. Ghosh's *JAA*.

[80] *JJ*, V, 121 ff.; VII, 130 ff.

[81] Ibid., V. 24 ff.; VI, 27 ff.

[82] Ibid., XVII, XVIII, etc.

[83] Unpublished thesis for Griffith Memorial Prize.

[84] *East Indian Bronzes*, Calcutta, 1979, 102 ff.

(1978) was a textual study of the subject as found in the *Rūpamaṇḍana*. The *Jain Art and Architecture*, edited in three volumes by A. Ghosh (1974) presented a panorama of rich cultural heritage of Jainism in the fields of monuments, sculptures and paintings (300 BC–AD 1800) with iconographical details presented by various experts. U.P. Shah and M.A. Dhaky's *Aspects of Jaina Art and Architecture* (1975) was also an important contribution which supplemented the contents of the aforesaid work. In Hindi B.N. Sharma dealt elaborately with Jain iconography in his *Jaina Pratimāyen* (1979). R.C. Dwivedi also edited a volume under the title *Jaina Art and Architecture* which was published in 1980. N.P. Tiwari's Hindi work *Jaina Pratimā-vijñāna* (1981) and C. Sivaramamurti's *Panorama of Jain Art: South India* (1983) were important additions to this branch of study.

The works on Hindu iconography were all rooted in two earlier basic works mentioned above—Gopinatha Rao's *Elements of Hindu Iconography* and J.N. Banerjea's *Development of Hindu Iconography*—both of which dealt extensively with the iconic features and representations of the major (Viṣṇu, Śiva, Śaktī, Sūrya and Gaṇapati) and minor (Kārtikeya, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Brahmā, Aṣṭadikpālas, Vyantara *devatās*, Garuḍa, Nandin, Āyudhapuruṣas and folk-deities) Hindu deities on the basis of textual descriptions and iconographical representation. Syncretistic deities such as Harihara, Ardhanārīśvara, Viṣṇu-Lokeśvara, Mārtaṇḍa-Bhairava were also taken into account. Subsequent works on Hindu iconography fell into three distinct categories. The first comprised works of general type in the line of Rao and Banerjea in which more of the canonical sources in regard to the conceptual and descriptive aspects and more of the extant specimens which were discovered in course of time from different parts of the country were added. The second comprised iconographical studies of specific deities belonging to any rank—high, middle or low. In the case of such studies, all iconic descriptions pertaining to a single deity as found in the texts were collected and then these descriptions were correlated with the sculptural finds and presented in a chronological sequence to demonstrate the evolution of various iconic types and features. The catalogues of museums containing descriptions of various images and also the vast literature pertaining to Indian art and sculptures provided the first hand materials of such studies. The third comprised a different class of study which was often referred to as iconology. Instead of collecting textual descriptions and their corresponding sculptural

representations this approach sought to read between the two emphasizing on the contributing factors—physical, mythological, anthropological, metaphysical, psychological, socio-economic and so on—behind the iconographical conceptualizations.

Among the works of the first category mention should be made of T.N. Srinivasan's *A Handbook of South Indian Images: An Introduction to the Study of Hindu Iconography* (1954) which classified and systematised the essentials of the earlier works of Gopinatha Rao, O.C. Gangoly, Dubreuil, H.K. Sastri and others on south Indian iconography and substantiated them with more sculptural specimens. D.N. Shukla's *Hindu Canons of Iconography and Painting* (1958) was a text-oriented study in the line of Gopinatha Rao in which a good number of unexplored sources were used. D.R. Thapar's *Icons in Bronze* (1961) was a study of images on the basis of selected deities, their iconic characteristics and regional variations, stylistic development and allied aspects of interest. R.S. Gupta's *Iconography of the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains* (1972) was the first work which covered all the three areas in a single volume. In the introductory chapter of this volume the meaning of the various objects held by deities in their hands and their significance had been explained. In the Hindu portion iconography of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and his incarnations, Śiva in his various *mūrtis*, Skanda-Kārttikeya, Vīrabhadra, Gaṇeśa, minor deities and the goddesses were discussed. In the Buddhist portion iconography of the Mortal and Dhyānī Buddhas, the Bodhisattvas, the Buddhist gods and goddesses and minor Buddhist deities and in the Jain portion that of the Tīrthaṅkaras, Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs, and Śruta and Vidyā Devīs were dealt with. Each portion was appended by an iconographical table giving details of iconic features of every deity. The author did not make any original research but had systematised and simplified what was obtained from the books of Gopinatha Rao, N.K. Bhattasali, J.N. Banerjea, B.T. Bhattacharyya, B.C. Bhattacharyya, Alice Getty, A.K. Gordon and U.P. Shah. By contrast, Bhagawant Sahai's *Iconography of Minor Hindu and Buddhist Deities* (1975) was more research oriented. This study was felt rather essential by the author in view of the fact that minor deities received scant treatment at the hands of the renowned scholars in their works on iconography. Among the Hindu deities the iconography of Indra, Agni, Yama, Varuṇa, Vāyu, Kubera, Nāga, Revanta, Kārttikeya, Bhairava, Harihara, Sarasvatī Lakṣmī, Mahiṣamardinī, Cāmuṇḍā and Sapta Mātṛkā was taken into account

while in the case of Buddhist deities iconic features of Jambhala, Trailokyavijaya, Aparājitā, Parṇaśabarī, Māricī and Hārītī were described. The scope of this work was restricted to the sculptures of northern India, but still, by way of comparison, some well known sculptures of southern India had also been taken note of. P.O. Sompura's *Pratimā Kalānidhi: An Album of Hindu Iconography* (1976), meant mainly for lay persons, was proved to be very important even to the specialists. S.B. Singh's *Brahmanical Icons in Northern India* (1977) was a study of the images of five principal Hindu deities from the earliest time to AD 1200. D.B Pandey's *Notes on Indian Iconography* (1978) was a collection of different aspects of the author's iconographical studies. O.P. Singh's *Religion and Iconography of Early Indian Coins* (1978) was a furtherance of the study of what J.N. Banerjea had initiated in the chapters on 'Deities and their Emblem in Coins and Seals' in his *magnum opus*. S.P. Tewari's *Hindu Iconography* (1979) was based on authological verses, literature, art and epigraphs. Iconography of composite images was studied by D.C. Bhattacharyya (1980) and S.K. Ramachandra (1982). A recent study on genesis of iconological concepts and iconographic development is to be found in Jyotsna Chawla's *The Ṛgvedic Deities and Their Icononic Forms* (1990). Did the Vedic Indians worship images? This question was differently answered by different groups of Vedic scholars. Max Müller, Wilson and Macdonell answered in negative while Bollensen and Venkateswara argued that images played a very prominent part in the religious practice of the Vedic Indians. Coomaraswamy held that the degree of anthropomorphism assigned to the Vedic deities might or might not be conducive to image worship in Vedic India, but the description of the Vedic deities undoubtedly helped to formulate the concrete concepts of many of the cult-gods of later times. Jyotsna's work on the concepts and forms, the relations and functions of the deities, is based on a new approach towards the Ṛgvedic descriptions and as such throws light on many points of interest pertaining to iconographical studies.

III

Iconographical studies pertaining to the sun-worship was practically initiated by T.A. Gopinatha Rao[85] who enumerated various forms of images of the Ādityas and the Navagrahas. He also compared the south and north Indian sun-images and concluded that

[85] *Elements of Hindu Iconography*, I, pt. II, 299–323.

there was no foreign influence in the south Indian tradition of sun-images while the north Indian images were influenced by Iranian traits. A similar viewpoint was also expressed by H.K. Sastri (1916).[86] In 1925, J.N. Banerjea gave exclusive attention to the evolution of solar iconography and as such narrated the stages in its growth.[87] M.S. Vats (1925–26) described a lintel with fine representation of sun on one-wheeled chariot,[88] and K.C. Sarkar described a rare image of the Sun-god with three or four heads and ten arms resembling the Mārtaṇḍa-bhairava type.[89] Sun-images from Dinajpur were described by N. Chakrabarti and S.K. Saraswati[90] and from the 24 Parganas by K. Datta,[91] G.P. Pandey's thesis (1939) *Iconographical Study of Indian Sun-God* provided a marked advancement in this branch of study. J.N. Banerjea in his article 'Sūrya, Ādityas and Navagrahas' (1948)[92] provided us with a chronological study of solar iconography from the earliest times to the medieval period tracing its origin in various symbols such as the rayed disc, the lotus, the gold-plate etc. found in the Vedic and Puranic literature. He dealt with the problems of Hellenism, Iranian influence and allied features in this article and also with the Ādityas and Navagrahas. In another article entitled 'Some Alien Traits of the North Indian Sun Icons' (1952),[93] he discussed some alien features of the solar iconography such as northerner's dress, boots, girdle round the waist, etc. The revised versions of these articles subsequently in 1956 formed a chapter of his *magnum opus* which comprised the following topics: Sūrya and his various aspects in the Vedic texts; worship of the Sun-god in the post-Vedic age; re-orientated Sun-cult of northern India in the early centuries of the Christian era and afterwards; aniconic representation of Sūrya in coins of the pre-Christian period; some early reliefs of the god; Sūrya figures from Gandhara and Mathura; images from Bengal; textual descriptions of two categories of medieval Sūrya reliefs; images from different parts of India; Dvādaśāditya; Revanta and

[86] *South Indian Images of Gods and Goddesses*, Madras, 1916.

[87] 'Sūrya in Brahmanical Arts' in *Ind. Ant.*, LIV, 1925.

[88] 'Sculptures from Ahar and Bulandsahar' in *ASIAR*, 1925–26, 172ff.

[89] 'A New Form of Sūrya from Varendra' in *IHQ*, II, 465–70.

[90] *JASB*, XXVIII, 147–50.

[91] *IHQ*, IX, 202–07.

[92] *JISOA*, XVI, 47–101.

[93] *IHQ*, XXVIII, 1–6.

Navagrahas. Subsequently V.C. Srivastava made a detailed study of solar iconography and summarized the results of earlier works done in this field.[94]

H. Daniel Smith's study of the iconographic data (1969) as found in the Pāñcarātra Āgamas[95] began with the theological and speculative supports for the use of icons, practical necessities requiring different types of images and the icons depicting the great devotees of the past and then proceeded in documenting with citations from relevant texts such technical aspects as selecting timbers for wooden icons, choosing stones for sculptures images, choosing metals for casting, preparing plaster for images, other materials used for iconographic representations, benefits of using particular materials, basic units of measurement, application of these units to types of icons, measurement of icons prepared for existing temples, comparative measurements of the main and functional icons, detailed measurements for specific parts of icons, the materials used in making pedestals, their shapes and proportions, details of construction and decoration and additional element called *prabhā* or encircling arc and then describing the iconographical features of the *vyūhas, avatāras, mūrtis* and female deities under the following heads: Vāsudeva, Śaṅkarṣaṇa, Aniruddha, Pradyumna (the four *Vyūhas*); Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Vāmana, Trivikrama, Narasiṃha, Paraśurāma, Rāma, Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa, Buddha, Kalkin (the *avatāras*); Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, Mādhava, Govinda, Viṣṇu, Madhusūdana, Trivikrama, Vāmana, Śrīdhara, Hṛṣikeśa, Padmanābha, Dāmodara (twelve *mūrtis*); the consorts of twelve *mūrtis*, Śrīlakṣaṇa, Bhū, Nīlā and different forms of Lakṣmī. Other forms of Viṣṇu such as Mahāviṣṇu, Śayanaviṣṇu, Lakṣmīnārāyaṇa, Śrīyaḥpati, Yajñavarāha, Hari, Upendra, Puruṣottama, Jagannātha, Janārdana, Acyuta, Hayagrīva, Yajñamūrti and Haṃsa along with some rare forms like Viśvarūpa or Ātmamūrtis as also attendant deities like Ananta, Garuḍa, Viśvaksena, Sudarśana, etc., the divine beings in the temple precincts, guardians of the gate, deities found in the first and second courtyards, eight directional the nine planetary deities, *cakra* and *śaṅkha*, divine beings of the outer courtyard, abstract principles, decoration and weapons of icons, the footstool, miscellaneous paraphernalia, the *sruk*-ladle and *sruva*-spatula

[94] *Sun-Worship in Ancient India*, Allahabad, 1972, 273–339; cf. L.P. Pandey, *Sun-Worship in Ancient India*, Varanasi, 1971; S.M. Gupta, *Sūrya Sun-God*, New Delhi, 1977.

[95] *A Sourcebook of Vaiṣṇava Iconography*, Madras, 1969.

used in oblations, etc. were described in detail. The Sanskrit portions of this volume were edited by K.K.A. Venkatachari and illustrations were prepared by V. Ganapati.

Most works on Vaiṣṇava iconography were concerned with the canonical sourcebooks outlining the iconic features of Viṣṇu images, their various postures like standing, seated or reclining, the rare and extraordinary forms, the incarnations, subordinate deities and various personified abstractions and with the sculptural specimens supplementing the textual descriptions. Pratapaditya Pal's study of the Vaiṣṇavite icons of Nepal (1970) and Kalpana Desai's general work on Vaiṣṇava iconography (1973) should be referred to in this connection.[96] Again, there were works on specific aspects, such as W.E. Begley's study of the iconography of Sudarśana Cakra (1973),[97] S.M. Gupta's iconographical study of incarnations (1974),[98] Nandita Krishna's study of the Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa aspect (1980),[99] etc. R. Champakalakshmi's (1981) made a thorough study of iconism pertaining to the Tamil-speaking region of south India within the time-span of 300 BC to AD 1300. The study looked at iconography as an index of socio-religious change at both the micro and the macro-levels and was broad in its sweep of observation and analysis of the evolution of ideas and concepts, as well as of their impact on social groups and religious systems. The basic Vaiṣṇava concepts and beliefs, the major and minor forms and *avatāras* of Viṣṇu, the principal and secondary goddesses and deities of Vaiṣṇava pantheon as well as syncretic forms were all examined in depth in the course of tracing the development of inconography. Besides the Introduction in which the authoress had outlined her viewpoints and the background in which the evolution of the Vaiṣṇava pantheon was traced, the work dealt with the following topics: Vaiṣṇava concepts in the Tamil Country; The Pañcavīras; Nārāyaṇa-Viṣṇu: The Three forms; The Ten Avatāras; Minor Avatāras; Other Forms of Viṣṇu; The Twenty-four Forms of Viṣṇu; Goddesses; Minor Deities; Āḻvārs and Ācāryas; The Weapons of Viṣṇu; Syncretic Forms; and the Trends of Iconographic Development.[100]

[96] *Vaiṣṇava Iconography in Nepal*, Calcutta, 1970; *Iconography of Viṣṇu*, New Delhi, 1973.

[97] *Viṣṇu's Flaming Wheel*, Delhi, 1973.

[98] *Viṣṇu and His Incarnations*, Delhi, 1974.

[99] *Art and Iconography of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa*, New Delhi, 1980.

[100] *Vaiṣṇava Iconography in the Tamil Country*, Delhi, 1981.

Śaiva iconography was extensively treated by Gopinatha Rao who gave an elaborate account of various types of Śiva-liṅgas (the god in phallic form) on the basis of various Śaiva Āgamas and other texts as well as on that of his elaborate study of one of the earliest such emblems, with the figure of Śiva carved on it discovered by him at Gudimalam near Renigunta in Andhra Pradesh. According to him, the *mukhaliṅgas* (phallus with human face, often with more than one face) illustrated in a way the combined mode of representing Śiva both in his human as well as phallic form. So far as the human forms of Śiva were concerned, they were divided into *ugra* (fierce) and *saumya* (placid) categories, each of which was further subdivided under two broad heads on the basis of their illustrating myths. Besides the *liṅgodbhava-mūrtis* containing the figure of the god on the phallus, Rao had referred to the *anugraha-mūrtis* (Śiva in his boon-giving forms), *saṃhāra-mūrtis* (Śiva in his destructive form), *dakṣiṇā-mūrtis* (Śiva as the expounder of the Śāstras), *nṛtya-mūrtis* (Śiva as master-dancer), etc. The south Indian *nṛtya-mūrtis* of Śiva at first showed a well-marked variety which, however, came to be merged in one outstanding type, the Śiva Naṭarāja. The sublime ideology underlying this very characteristic dancing type of Śiva images was elaborately expounded by A.K. Coomaraswamy in his *The Dance of Śiva* who recognised in these images the expression of the fivefold activities of the god, viz. *sṛṣṭi* (creation), *sthiti* (preservation), *saṃhāra* (destruction), *anugraha* (confirment of grace) and *tirobhāva* (clearance of illusion.) On the basis of the Tamil text *Unmai Viḷakkam* he explained the Naṭarāja form as symbolizing creation (emanating from the drum) protection (proceeding from the hand of hope), destruction (arising from the ball of fire) and liberation (springing from the foot held aloft). He regarded the Naṭarāja icon as a perfect visual image of 'becoming' adequate complement and contrast to the Buddha images of pure 'being' and found in it an excellent "synthesis of science, religion and art". Banerjea made a thorough survey of Śaiva iconography throwing light on the real nature of Śiva-liṅga, classification of conventional Śiva-liṅgas, Mānuṣa-liṅgas and their different varieties, *mukhaliṅgas*, *liṅgodbhava-mūrti*, Śiva in his human forms, *dakṣiṇāmūrtis*, *nṛtyamūrtis*, the real character of the *trimūrti* of Elephanta, images illustrating tenets of the Āgamanta or Śuddha Śaiva school, images of Lakulīśa, non-mythological groups of *saumya* and *ugra* varieties, Śaiva images illustrating legends of a peaceful character such as the *anugraha-mūrtis*, *kalyāṇasundra* or *vaivāhika-mūrtis* etc., and Śaiva images illustrating the stories associated with his specific acts of destruction such as *gajāsura-saṃhāramūrtis*, *tripurāntaka* and *kālārimūrtis*, *kāmadahana* and *śarabheśamūrtis*, etc. Most of the works dealing with the history of Śaivism mentioned in the earlier chapters dealt with relevant aspects of Śaiva iconography. Among the recent works in this field mention may be made of C. Sivaramamurti's *Naṭarāja in Art, Thought and Literature* (1974) and *Śatarudrīya: Vibhūti of Śiva's Iconography* (1976), B.N. Sharma's *Iconography of Sadāśiva* (1976) and J.K. Sarma's *The Development of Early Śaiva Art and Architecture* (1981).

Various birth-stories of Gaṇeśa and his iconographical features were collected by Gopinatha Rao in which the elephant faced and pot-bellied god was described as having two or four hands, one tooth, wood-apple, sweetmeat, elephant-goad, noose, snake, rosary, lotus etc. Many were the iconographic varieties of the god described in different texts under such names as, Bīja-Gaṇapati, Bāla-Gaṇapati, Taruṇa-Gaṇapati, Vīra-Vighneśa, Śakti-Gaṇeśa, Lakṣmī-Gaṇeśa, Mahā-Gaṇeśa, Haridrā-Gaṇeśa, Unmatta-Vināyaka, Nṛtya-Gaṇapati, Ucchiṣṭa-Gaṇapati, Heramba-Gaṇapati, etc. Coomaraswamy in his *Yakṣas* regarded Gaṇeśa as a primitive tribal deity belonging to the Yakṣa type because of the big belly and general character of the god. He drew our attention to the earliest representation of an elephant-headed Yakṣa on the Amaravati coping and said that though the elephant-headed deity did not find mention under the name 'Gaṇeśa', he was "effectively and perhaps actually equivalent to Kubera or Maṇibhadra". Iconography of Gaṇeśa was studied in detail by Alice Getty in her *Gaṇeśa: A Monograph on the Elephant-Faced God* (1936). We have already had the occasion to deal with its contents in an earlier chapter.[101] Some of the observations of Getty may be quoted here. According to her, Gaṇeśa "seems only to have been known to the uneducated classes up to the sixth century". Śāktism adopted Gaṇeśa as its special deity and the concept of Gaṇeśānī, the *śakti* of Gaṇeśa had found

[101]See also Jean Herbert, *Gaṇeśa: Précédé d'une étude sur Dieu chez les Hindus*, Lyon, 1946; V.K. Rao, 'The Gaṇapati Cult' in *QJMS*, XLI, 91 ff.; Srikanta Iyer, 'The Popular view of Gaṇeśa in Madras' in *Ind. Ant.*, XXX, 255 ff.; S.K. Saraswati, 'The Greatness of Gaṇapati' in *JISOA*, VIII, 41ff.; T.G. Aravamuthan, 'Gaṇeśa: clue to a culture and Cult' in *Jour. Oriental Research*, XVIII, 226 ff.; *Gaṇeśa*, Madras, 1951

sculptural representation at Bheraghat and other places inside and outside India. The cult of Gaṇeśa was adopted by the Buddhists and Jains. Śiva's third eye on the forehead appeared in many statues of Gaṇapati. Gaṇeśa is shown in India with two faces in icons of Gaṇapati Jayantī; and with three faces in Japan. More common are, especially in Nepal, the image of Heramba Gaṇapati having five heads. In Tiruchirapally, *Pañcamukhī* or five-headed Gaṇapati is worshipped still now. As regards apparel Gaṇeśa is also given the jewelled headdress of Śiva, as well as the crescent while his hands hold Śiva's symbols, the trident, the *aṅkuśa* and the rosary. In Nepal and Tibet, some images of Gaṇeśa carry the *cintāmaṇi* or the symbol of the germ of life. In many Gaṇeśa images from Java small Nandis and skulls are found. Other iconic features of Gaṇeśa were also described by Getty with reference to the images of India and outside on the basis of which she affirmed that "in all countries, where he has been worshipped, images of Gaṇeśa have been found in which he is identified with his father Śiva".

Coomaraswamy's study of the *Yakṣas* (in two parts, 1928, 1931) convincingly demonstrated how the iconography of the lower gods influenced the iconic types of the higher cult deities. In his own words: "In early Indian art, so far as cult images are concerned, one iconic type stands out predominant, that is the standing figure with the right hand raised, the left hand on the hip.... Of this type are the early images of Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs, whether independent or attendant. And it is also this type which provided the model for cult images of other deities, such as Śiva or Buddha, when the necessities of *bhakti* determined the appearance of all deities in visible forms". He made a sharp distinction between the higher and popular gods and held that it was the latter class which evoked the interest of ancient artists and craftsmen who preferred to make popular objects of worship such as the Yakṣas and Nāgas, the guardian and protective deities and so forth.[102] Iconography of Skanda-Kārttikeya was dealt with in the works done on this god mentioned in the preceding chapter and also in the important works on Hindu iconography. J.N. Banerjea studied the iconic feature of this god as found on some Ayodhya coins, the coins of the Yaudheyas and others who dedicated their states to this god and the figures of Skanda-Kumāra, Viśākha and Mahāsena on some

[102]Among recent works see R.N. Misra, *Yakṣa Cult and Iconography*, New Delhi, 1981.

coins of Huviska, with an historical analysis of Kārttikeya and his various aspects in early Indian literature, epigraphic references to his worship, textual descriptions of Skanda-Kārttikeya images and some Gupta and post-Gupta images of this god. Subsequent works also insisted on all these aspects. We have already had the occasion to refer to the works of P.K. Agrawala and others. Some of the iconographic traits of Skanda-Kārttikeya and their mythological background were detected by R. Dessigane and P.Z. Pattabiramin (1967)[103] Bhagavant Sahai (1975) made an extensive study on Kārttikeya iconography in the line of Banerjea with some more addition of facts. So did Kanchan Sinha who made an interesting study of the iconographical peculiarities of Kārttikeya on Indian coins and seals, especially, with reference to the coins of the Audumbaras, Yaudheyas, Kuṣāṇas and Guptas. She also took note of the iconographical texts like the *Samarāṅganasūtradhāra* etc. and dealt with the sculptural representations of the Kuṣāṇa, Gupta and post-Gupta periods.[104] Among the less important deities, the iconography of Revanta, son of Sūrya, was studied first by Banerjea and subsequently by B.N. Sharma.[105] Likewise the iconography of Balarāma was extensively treated by N.P. Joshi,[106] on the ground work already made by Banerjea. K.C. Aryan and Subhasini Aryan's *Hanumān in Indian Art and Mythology* should also be mentioned in this connection.

The iconography of Śakti, viewed as the Female Principle of creation and also as the source and spring of many other activities, and conceived of in forms of numerous goddesses of various ranks and status was dealt within most of the major works of iconography in which the iconographic development of the goddess cult from the protohistoric Harappan period to the medieval period of Indian history was reviewed. Gopinatha Rao had collected numerous names of various forms of the goddess and their iconographic descriptions from different Āgamas; but he could illustrate only a few of these forms by extant stone and bronze sculptures of the

[103]*La Legende de Skanda*, Pondicherry, 1967.

[104]*Kārttikeya in Indian Art and Literature*, Delhi, 1979, 71–88, 109–44; see also K. Navaratnam, *Kārttikeya: The Divine Child*, Bombay, 1973; F.W. Clothey, *The Many Faces of Murugan*, The Hague, 1976–77; Upendra Thakur, *On Kārttikeya*, Delhi, 1981.

[105]*Iconography of Revanta*, Delhi, 1975.

[106]*Iconography of Balarāma*, Delhi, 1979.

early and late medieval period.[107] Banerjea brought to light the iconic features of the Harappan Mother Goddess and also those of Sarasvatī, Durgā, Lakṣmī, Bhadrā, Nana, Umā, Phālgunī, etc. as found on early coins and seals. So far as the sculptured figures were concerned he dealt elaborately with the Māṭṛkā and Mahiṣāsuramardinī icons and also with those of Durgā Siṃhavāhinī, Ekānaṃśā and Tripura-Bhairavī.[108] Coomaraswamy in his brilliant paper entitled 'Early Indian Iconography' dealt with the iconism of Lakṣmī. According to him her relation with waters was attested by her lotus symbol with which she was associated in three ways—as holding it in her right hand, as being supported by lotus serving as seat or pedestal and as surrounded by flowering stems and growing leaves. He also said that Ardochso, the West Asiatic goddess of fortune, bearing a cornucopia, figured on the coins of the first century AD were gradually fused with the indigenous Lakṣmī. According to him Śrī-Lakṣmī combined an abstract Vedic terminology with a concrete Indian Mother Goddess and a definite iconographic type, very early developed, persisted almost up to the present day. Regarding Gaja-Lakṣmī he dismissed the theory of the nativity of Buddha upheld by Foucher,[109] C. Sivaramamurti's 'Goddess Lakṣmī and Her Symbols (1941)[110] touched some aspects of Lakṣmī iconography, but a complete study was first found in Govinda Chandra Ray's Hindi work *Prācina Bhārat men Lakṣmī Pratimā* (1968). Subsequently Bhagwant Sahai (1975) made a thorough study of Lakṣmī iconography in an historical perspective.[111] U.N. Dhal's historical study of Lakṣmī under the title *Goddess Lakṣmī: Origin and Development* (1978) contained numerous iconographical material though the author did not make any specific iconographical study. Among the recent works on the iconography of Lakṣmī mention should be made of N. Ghosh's *Concept and Iconography of the Goddess of Abundance and Fortune in Three Indian Religions* (1979) in which, besides the Brahmanical or Hindu Lakṣmī, the Buddhist and Jain concepts were also taken into account. Mention should also be made in this connection to

[107] *EHI*, I, 338–400.

[108] *DHI*, 133–37, 166–68, 193–98, 489–509.

[109] *Eastern Art*, I, 1929, 33 ff., 125 ff.

[110] *JUPHS*, XIV, 21 ff.; cf. his *Śrī Lakṣmi in Indian Art and Literature*, 1982.

[111] *Iconography of Minor Hindu and Buddhist Deities*, 157–79.

P.K. Agrawala's interesting work *Śrīvatsa: The Babe of Goddess Śrī* (1974). We have already had the occasion to refer to the iconographical works on Sarasvatī while dealing with the studies on different aspects of her cult in the preceding chapter.[112]

B. Sahai's study of the iconography of minor deities included, besides Sarasvatī and Lakṣmī, Cāmuṇḍā, Mahiṣamardinī and Saptamātṛkā. Among all these deities, as we have stated above, Mahiṣamardinī and Saptamātṛkā received sufficient scholarly attention since the beginnings of the study of sculpture and iconography. Most of the works on Indian sculpture dealt with the iconographic characteristics of the Mahiṣamardinī and Saptamātṛkā images. Among recent works, K.C. Aryan's *The Little Goddesses* (1980) dealt with the Māṭṛkās. On the Śakti of Gaṇeśa we have two iconographical works—*The Goddess Vainayaki, the Female Gaṇeśa* (1978) by P.K. Agrawala and *Iconography of Vainayakī* (1979) by B.N. Sharma. Balaram Srivastava's *Iconography of Śakti* (1978) was based on the text called *Śrītattvanidhi* while M.C.P. Srivastava's *Mother Goddess in Indian Art, Archaeology and Literature* (1979) was of the nature of historical study with emphasis on iconographical aspects. R.D. Trivedi's *Iconography of Pārvatī* (1981) was also an important addition to the iconographical literature. A comparative iconological approach was met with in Gerald Larson, Pratapaditya Pal and Rebecca Gowan's *In Her Image: The Great Goddesses of Indian Asia and Madonna in Christian Culture* (1980). Pratapaditya Pal's *Hindu Religion and Iconology* (1981) was based upon the *Tantrasāra* description of the iconographical and conceptual features the goddesses such as Vāgiśvarī or Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī, Gajalakṣmī, Mahālakṣmī, Kamalā, Dhanadā, Durgā, Jayadurgā, Mahiṣamardinī, Kātyāyanī, Annapūrṇā, Gaurī, Brahmāśrī, Viśālākṣī, Tvaritā, Nityā, Vajraprastāriṇī, Śūlinī, Karṇapiśācī, Yoginīs, the ten Mahāvidyās and Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva deities. It was written with the purpose to provide scholars with both translation of the original texts as well

[112] See also Rao, *EHI*, 1(II), 377 ff.; N.K. Bhattasali, *IBBSDM*, 181–90; J.N. Banerjea, *DHI*, 376–80; Bhagwant Sahai, op. cit., 141–55; B.C. Bhattacharyya, *Jaina Iconography*, 122–32; A. Getty, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism*, 127 ff.; B.T. Bhattacharyya, *IBI*, 349–52; A.C. Vidyabhusana's *Sarasvatī*, 1933; Md. Israil Khan's *Sarasvatī in Sanskrit Literature*, 1978; Gode in *JISOA*, IX, 133 ff.; Bhattacharyya in *K.B. Pathak Com. Volume*, 50 ff.; G.V. Davane in *Jour.Univ. Bombay*, XXXVII, 70–77; A.S. Gupta in *Purāṇa*, IV, 55–95; V. Yasodadevi, 'Sarasvatī through the Ages' in *JIH*, XLI, 681–97; etc. The most comprehensive treatment of the iconography of Sarasvatī is to be found in, K.L. Bhattacharyya's *Sarasvatī*, Calcutta, 1983.

as an analysis of important Bengali Tantras. The introductory portion dealt with sources of the text of *Tantrasāra*, the author and his times, iconological content kulācāra, sacrifice, liquors, women and *maithuna, siddhi, śavasādhanā, dīkṣā* and *guru, mantras*, letters and *pīṭha* symbology and concluding remarks. Among the most recent works D.R. Rajeshwari's *Śakti Iconography* (1989) dealt with development with the concept of Śakti, and the iconographical features of Lakṣmī, Saptamāṭṛkā, Durgā, her nine forms, Mahiṣamardinī, ten Mahāvidyās, local goddesses, weapons and vehicles as well as the description of the goddess as found in the canons.

IV

Modern studies on Indian religious terminology were evidently rooted in the researches on Vedic language and literature. Franz Bopp's *Glossarium Linguae Sanskritae* (1830) was the first modern work of Sanskrit technical terms dealing with various topics pertaining to religious ideas. His *Comparative Grammar* (1833–52) opened a new horizon in the study of comparative philology in which Vedic words served as the standard of association with those of other Indo-European languages. In 1852 Rudolf Roth published the first critical edition of Yāska's *Nirukta*. The first exhaustive glossary of the *Ṛgveda* was prepared by Hermann Guenther Grassman who in two volumes under the title *Worterbuch zum Ṛgveda* (1867–77). It was followed by Victor Henry's *Manual de Sanskrit Vedique* (1890) Macdonell's edition and translation of the *Bṛhaddevatā*, which is in content a glossary though in form a compendium of Vedic religion embracing every aspect of it, was a landmark in the branch of study. Maurice Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance* (1906) came out as a novel guide for the specification of Vedic verses. Another important publication was the *Vedic Index* (1912) by Macdonell and Keith. Though its purpose was to deal with non-religious topics, it contained interpretations of a good number of terms and concepts with reference to their sources which had direct bearing on religious aspects. Among the recent works Visvabandhu's *Vedic Word Concordance* (1955–73) published in 16 volumes, deserves special mention. S.C. Chakravarti's *Paribhāṣās in the Śrautasūtras* (1980) should also be referred to in this connection.

As early as in 1808 Colebrooke published a modern edition of the *Amarakoṣa* with marginal translation. The first *Sanskrit-English*

Dictionary was prepared by Wilson which was published in 1819. Its revised edition came out in 1832. Monier-Williams compiled a bigger dictionary in 1851 which was, however, overshadowed by the publication in 1852 of the first part of the monumental *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* (also known as *St. Petersburg Dictionary*) compiled by Rudolph Roth and Otto Böhtlingk. Benfey's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* comprising selected words with greater emphasis on the contents of the works of Sanskrit authors came out in 1866. After the publication of the first part of the *St. Petersburg Dictionary* (the seven volume project was completed in 1875) Monier-Williams felt the need of bringing out a fresh and more detailed dictionary which was eventually published in 1872 (an enlarged and improved edition of it came out in 1899). Macdonell also published a *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* in 1892 which laid more emphasis on the Vedic words. Th. Zachariae's *Die Indischen Wörterbucher* was published in 1897. Louis Renou's *Dictionarie Sanskrit Francae* was published in 1938.

In 1824 Bengamin Clough published *A Compendious Pali Grammar with a Copious Vocabulary in the Same Language.* George Turner's edition and translation of the *Mahāvaṃsa* (1837) marked the first important attempt to introduce the treasure of Pali literature to the scholars of the West. An important advancement was achieved with the publication of the well known *Dictionary of Pali Language* (1875) by R.C. Childers, but with the increase in the publications of the Pali Text Society (founded by T.W. Rhys Davids in 1881) when this dictionary was found to be inadequate, Rhys Davids conceived the idea of compiling a Pali dictionary on international basis (1902). But it was not until 1916 that he set to work on this dictionary with the assistance of William Stede. Rhys Davids lived to see only the first three parts of this project. His eminent colleague Stede compiled the work till 1925. It was followed by *Critical Pali Dictionary* by Dines Anderson and Helmer Smith (1927–28). The *Pali Tripiṭaka Concordance* prepared by scholars like Woodward and others were edited by E.M. Hare was brought out by the PTS in 1952–55. Mention must also be made in this connection to the celebrated *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* compiled in two volumes by G.P. Malalasekera (1937–38). Buddhist Sanskrit terms have been dealt with in the Sanskrit dictionaries, but there was a hybrid Sanskrit used by early Buddhist writers which had been studied by F. Edgerton in his *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar*

and Dictionary (1953). Among numerous Chinese lexical works P.C. Bagchi's *Deux Lexiques Sanskrit Chinois* (1929, 1937) was most useful insofar as the study of Buddhist terminology was concerned. Study of Tibetan Buddhist terminology was initiated by Alexander Csoma de Koros and followed by a host of eminent scholars. In this connection we may specially refer to Sarat Chandra Das, one of the founders of modern Tibetan studies, whose *Tibetan-English Dictionary* came out in 1902. Among the Japanese scholars K. Kasahara published as early as in 1885, a work entitled *Dharmasaṃgraha* which was an ancient collection of Buddhist technical terms. C. Anakuma's *Dictionary of Proper Names in Indian Buddhism* came out in 1930. In 1926 S. Lévi sponsored the project of compiling an encyclopaedic dictionary, the *Hobogirin*. His collaborators were Takakusu, Aneṣaki, Inoue, Suziama and others.

The first landmark in the history of Jain terminological studies was the publication of the German translation of Hemacandra's *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* in 1847 by Böhtlingk Riew. Since 1920, researches on Jainism had taken a manifold course, though the main emphasis was on literary studies. Besides critical editions and translations of the canonical and non-canonical texts, comprehensive and analytical historical works and specialized studies, religious and philosophical terms of Jainism were studied by Weber, Bühler, Jacobi, Hoernle, Glasenapp, Kamptz, Schübring and their successors. So far as the modern lexical works are concerned, Vīrarājendra Suri's Sanskrit encyclopaedia *Abhidhānarājendra Kosha* (1913–25) incorporated numerous Jain Prakrit terms taken from the canonical and scholastic literature of the Śvetāmbaras. This was followed by Jain Muni Ratnachandra's *Ardhamāgadhī Dictionary* (1923–32) and Haragovinda Das Sheth's *Paia-Sadda-mahannavo, Prakrit-Hindi Dictionary*. A complete Digambara Jain dictionary entitled *Bṛhad Jaina Śabdārṇava* came out in two volumes between 1930 and 1934. Among subsequent works the most important is *Lexicographical Studies in Jain Sanskrit* (1962) by B.J. Sandesara and G.P. Thakur.

In the case of the Vedic words scholars did their best by applying all the existing methods to arrive at the real meaning. As is known to all, it is only with the help of the commentaries that the Vedic texts can be read or understood somehow. Sāyaṇa's commentary was composed 2500 years after the compilation of the *Ṛgveda*. It is not unlikely that Sāyaṇa might have consulted some

earlier commentaries which are now non-existent, but the fact cannot be ignored that the meaning he had attributed to the words of the *Ṛgveda* were partly his own invention. The religious terms and concepts of the later Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas are in certain cases so much obscure that the earlier commentators failed to make out any sense from most of them. Some of the older European interpreters of the *Ṛgveda*, such as H.H. Wilson, depended solely on the commentary of Sāyaṇa, while Rudolph Roth denied that a commentator who lived more than two thousand years after the composition of the book explained by him, could know anything which the modern scholars with their philological criticism and with the resources of linguistic science, could not fathom or understand better. Most researchers, however, took an intermediary position. The general approach was that where they had found Indo-European roots they sought to reach at the original meaning on the basis of comparative study taking into account similar words found in other Indo-European languages. Where situation did not permit they banked on indigenous commentaries.

While translating the Buddhist texts scholars tried to make literal translation as far as possible, but this did not yield the desired results. E. Burnouf thought that only Indian sources provided evidence on genuine Buddhism while V.P. Vasilev held that Buddhism in its totality of its development could be understood only from Tibetan and Chinese sources in addition to the Indian ones. Vasilev's viewpoint enabled him to determine the exact meaning of many crucial terms and his methodology was followed by Minayeff, Stcherbatsky and Rosenberg in their terminological studies. The basic technical terms of Buddhism, according to their opinion had so far been translated just anyhow. E. Conze held that the Mahāyānic Buddhist terms had not been adequately interpreted. While some terminological works in the field of Buddhism and Jainism have recently been done, the Brahmanical systems (except in the field of the Vedas) and their offshoots have not sufficiently been treated. The basic reason is that, unlike the Buddhist and Jain texts, the Purāṇas and other sectarian treatises have not been favoured with critical editions. It is only in the case of the Tantras that we have a good number of terminological works, thanks to the efforts of Sir John Woodroffe and his colleagues. The development of each religious system of India being largely

conditioned by its inter connections and contradictions with others it can be properly understood only when the vast terminological resources of each system with their many-sided suggestivity are deligently worked out from a comparative point of view.[113]

[113]For details see the introduction of the present author's *Glossary of Indian Religious Terms and Concepts*, New Delhi, 1989.

Select Bibliography*

Appasamy, A.J., *The Theology of Hindu Bhakti*, Madras, 1970.

Atre, Subhangana, *The Archetypal Mother*, Pune, 1987.

Arora, R.K., *Historical and Cultural Data from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*, Delhi, 1972.

Bagchi, S.G., *Eminent Śākta Centres in Eastern India*, Calcutta, 1980.

Banerjee, P., *Early Indian Religions*, New Delhi, 1973.

Banerji, S.C., *Tantra in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1978; *Studies in the Mahāpurāṇas*, Calcutta, 1991; *New Light on Tantra*, Calcutta, 1992.

Basu, R., *A Critical Study of the Milindapañho*, Delhi, 1978.

Bazaz, P.N., *The Role of Bhagavadgītā in Indian History*, New Delhi, 1975.

Beane, W.C., *Myth, Cult and Symbols in Śākta Hinduism: A Study on the Indian Mother Goddess*, Leiden, 1977.

Begley, W.E., *Viṣṇu's Flaming Wheel*, Delhi, 1973.

Beyer, C., *The Cult of Tārā*, London, 1973.

Bhagowalia, Urmila, *Vaiṣṇavism in Northern India*, New Delhi, 1980.

Bharadwaj, S.M., *Hindu Places of Pilgrimage in India*, Berkeley, 1973.

Bhattacharyya, B., *Śaivism and the Phallic World*, rev. ed., New Delhi, 1993.

Bhattacharyya, D., *Mythological and Ritual Symbolism: A Study with Reference to the Vedic and Tantric Agni*, Delhi, 1984.

Bhattacharyya, D.C., *Studies in Buddhist Iconography*, New Delhi, 1978.

Bhattacharyya, K.L., *Sarasvatī*, Calcutta, 1983.

Bhattacharyya, N.N., *History of the Śākta Religion*, New Delhi, 1974; *Ancient Indian Rituals*, New Delhi, 1975; *Jain Philosophy: Historical Outline*, New Delhi, 1976; *Indian Mother Goddess*, sec. ed., New Delhi, 1977; *History of Researches on Indian Buddhism*, New Delhi, 1981; *History of the Tantric Religion*, New Delhi, 1982; *A Glossary of Indian Religious Terms and Concepts*, New Delhi, 1988; *Buddhism in the History of Indian Ideas*, New Delhi, 1993.

Bhattacharji, S., *The Indian Theogony*, Calcutta, 1970.

Biswas, B., *Cult of Śiva*, Calcutta, 1988.

*The books and articles referred to in this volume are mentioned with date and place of publication in the footnotes. Here we are giving a list of some important works which have been published after 1970.

Blake, R.M., *The Origins of Vīraśaiva Sects*, Delhi, 1992.
Bregenhoj, C., *Ṛgveda as the Key to Folklore*, Eng. trans. by M.G. Abrahamsen, Helsinki, 1987.
Brocklington, J.L., *Righteous Rāma: The Evolution of an Epic*, Delhi, 1984.
Brown, C.M., *God as Mother: An Historical Study of the Brahmavaivarta Purāṇa*, Hartford, 1974.
Buckne, R.S. and Stuart-Fox, M., *The Twilight Language*, Delhi, 1987.
Caillat, C., *Atonement in Ancient Ritual of the Jain Monks*, Ahmedabad, 1975.
Chakravarti, C., *Common Life in the Ṛgveda and Atharvaveda: An Account of the Folklore of the Vedic Period*, Calcutta, 1977.
Chakravarti, M., *The Concept of Śiva through the Ages*, New Delhi, 1986.
Chakravarti, S.C., *Paribhāṣās in the Śrauta Sūtras*, Calcutta, 1980.
Chakravarti, Uma, *The Social Dimensions of Early Buddhism*, Delhi, 1987.
Champakalakshmi, R., *Vaiṣṇava Iconography in Tamil Country*, New Delhi, 1981.
Chang, G.C.C., *Buddhist Teaching of Totality*, Delhi, 1972.
Chatterjee, A.K., *Readings on Yogācāra Buddhism*, Delhi, 1971.
Chatterjee, S.K., *The Rāmāyaṇa: Its Character, Genesis, History, Expansion, Exodus: A Resumé*, Calcutta, 1978.
Chattopadhyaya, Aloka, *Catalogue of the Indian (Buddhist) Texts in Tibetan Translation: Kanjur and Tanjur*, Calcutta, 1972.
Chattopadhyaya, D.P., *Religion and Society*, Bangalore, 1987.
Chaudhuri, N.C., *Hinduism*, New Delhi, 1979.
Chaudhuri, S., *Analytical Study of the Abhidharmakośa*, Calcutta, 1983.
Choudhuri, Usha, *Indra and Varuṇa in Indian Mythology*, Delhi, 1981.
Clothey, F.W., *The Many Faces of Murukan: The History and Meaning of a South Indian God*, The Hague, 1976–77.
— and Lang, Bruce J., eds., *Experiencing Śiva*, Delhi, 1983.
Coburn, T.B., *Devī Māhātmya: The Crystallizations of the Goddess Tradition*, Delhi, 1984.
Courtright, P.B., *Gaṇeśa*, New York, 1985.
Dandekar, R.N., *Insights into Hinduism*, Delhi, 1971; *Vedic Mythological Tracts*, Delhi, 1979.

Dange, S.A., *Pastoral Symbolism from the Ṛgveda*, Delhi, 1970; *Vedic Concept of Field and the Divine Fructification*, Delhi, 1971; *Sexual Symbolism in Vedic Ritual*, Delhi, 1979; *Glimpses from Purānic Myth*, Delhi, 1987.
Dange, Sindhu S., *The Bhāgavata Purāṇa: Mytho-Social Study*, Delhi, 1984.
Dargyay, E., *Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet*, Delhi, 1978.
Darian, S.G., *The Ganges in Myth and History*, Honolulu, 1978.
De, S.C., *Historicity of the Rāmāyaṇa*, Delhi, 1976.
Dehejia, Vidya, *The Yoginī Cult: A Tantric Tradition*, New Delhi, 1986.
Desai, S.M., *Haribhadra's Yoga Works and Psychosynthesis*, Ahmedabad, 1983.
Dhal, U.N., *Goddess Lakṣmī: Origin and Development*, New Delhi, 1978.
Dhavamony, M., *Love of God according to the Śaiva Siddhānta*, Oxford, 1971.
Dikshit, K.K., *Jain Ontology*, Ahmedabad, 1971.
Douglas, N., *Tantra Yoga*, New Delhi, 1971.
Drabu, V.N., *Śaivāgamas: A Study in the Socio-Economic Ideas and Institutions of Kashmir*, New Delhi, 1990.
Drury, N., *The Sacrificial Ritual in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, Delhi, 1981.
Dube, S.N., *Cross Currents in Early Buddhism*, New Delhi, 1980.
Dunorvila, R.A., *Śaiva Siddhānta Theology*, New Delhi, 1983.
Dutt, N., *Buddhist Sects*, Calcutta, 1970; *Mahāyāna Buddhism*, Calcutta, 1973.
Dwivedi, D.C., *Contribution of Jainism to Indian Culture*, Varanasi, 1973.
Eschmann, A. et al., *The Cult of Jagannātha and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, New Delhi, 1978.
Gangadharan, N., *Liṅga Purāṇa: A Study*, Delhi, 1980.
Gaston, A.M., *Śiva in Dance, Myth and Iconography*, Delhi, 1982.
Gatwood, L.E., *Devī and the Spouse Goddess*, New Delhi, 1985.
Gonda, J., *Notes on Names and the Name of God in Ancient India*, Amsterdam, 1970; *The Dual Divinities in the Religion of the Vedas*, Amsterdam, 1974; *The Vedic God Mitra*, Leiden, 1972.
Goyal, S.R., *The Religious History of Ancient India*. 2 vols., Meerut, 1984; *A History of Indian Buddhism*, Meerut, 1987.

Grover, Usha, *Symbolism of Āraṇyakas and Their Impact on the Upaniṣads*, New Delhi, 1987.
Guenther, H.V., *Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice*, London, 1972.
Gupta, R.S., *Iconography of the Hindus, Buddhists and Jains*, Aurangabad, 1972.
Gupta, S. and Goudriean, T., *Hindu Tantrism*, Leiden, 1979.
Gupta, S.M., *Viṣṇu and His Incarnations*, Delhi, 1974; *Sūrya: The Sun God*, Delhi, 1977; *Kārttikeya: Son of Śiva*, Bombay, 1986.
Gupta, S.P., *Disposal of the Dead and Physical Types in Ancient India*, Delhi, 1972.
Guseva, N.R., *Jainism*, Eng. trans. from Russian by Y.S. Redkar, Bombay, 1971.
Hale, W.E., *Asura in Early Vedic Religion*, New Delhi, 1986.
Handa, O.C., *Śiva in Art*, New Delhi, 1992.
Hardy, F., *Viraha Bhakti: The Early History of Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India*, New Delhi, 1983.
Harman, W.P., *The Sacred Marriage of a Hindu Goddess*, Delhi, 1992.
Hassnain, F.M., *Buddhist Kashmir*, New Delhi, 1973.
Hawley, J.S. and Wulf, D.M., eds., *The Divine Consort*, Berkeley, 1982.
Hindery, R., *Comparative Ethics in Hindu and Buddhist Traditions*, Delhi, 1978.
Hingorani, A.T., *Teachings of the Gītā*, Bombay, 1971.
Hoffman, F.J., *Rationality and Mind in Early Buddhism*, Delhi, 1987.
Howard, W., *Vedic Recitations in Vārāṇasī*, Delhi, 1986.
Jain, B.C., *Jainism in Buddhist Literature*, Nagpur, 1972.
Jain, J.C., *Vasudevahiṇḍi: An Authentic Jaina Version of the Bṛhatkathā*, Ahmedabad, 1978.
Jain, Muni V.K., *Jain Sects and Schools*, Delhi, 1975.
Jash, P., *History of Śaivism*, Calcutta, 1974.
Jayakar, P., *The Earth Mother*, New Delhi, 1989.
Jha, M., *Dimensions of Pilgrimage*, New Delhi, 1985.
Jha, R.C., *Vedantic and Buddhist Concept of Reality*, Delhi, 1973.
Jha, V., 'Social Content of the Bhagavadgītā,' in *IHR*, XI, 1985, 1–44.
Joshi, J.R., *Some Minor Deities in Vedic Mythology and Ritual*, Pune, 1977.
Joshi, L.M., *Facets of Jaina Religiousness in Comparative Light*, Ahmedabad, 1981.

Joshi, N.P., *Iconography of Balarāma*, Delhi, 1979.
Jung, C.J., *Maṇḍala Symbolism*, trans. by R.F.C. Hull, Princeton, 1972.
Kapur, T., *Symbolism of Hinduism*, Delhi, 1981.
Khan, I., *Brahmā in the Purāṇas*, Ghaziabad, 1981; *Sarasvati in Sanskrit Literature*, Ghaziabad, 1978.
Khosla, S., *History of Buddhism in Kashmir*, New Delhi, 1972.
Kinsley, D.R., *The Sword and the Flute: Kāli and Kṛṣṇa*, Berkeley, 1975.
Krishna, M., *Art and Iconography of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa*, New Delhi, 1980.
Kumar, P., *Śakti Cult in Ancient India*, Varanasi, 1974; *Śakti and Her Episodes*, Delhi, 1981.
Kumar, S.V., *The Puranic Lore of the Holy Water Places*, New Delhi, 1983.
Lahiri, A.K., *Vedic Vṛtra*, Delhi, 1984.
Lahiri, Latika, *Chinese Monks in India*, Delhi, 1988.
Lalwani, K.C., *Bhagavatī Sūtra*, 4 vols., Calcutta, 1980.
Layle, P.G., *Studies in the Devī Bhāgavata*, Bombay, 1973.
Leslie, J., ed., *Roles and Rituals for Hindu Women*, Delhi, 1992.
Lincoln, B., *Priests, Warriors and Cattle*, Berkeley, 1981.
Ling, T.O., *The Buddha*, London, 1973.
Lorenzen, D.M., *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, New Delhi, 1972.
Mahalingam, T.V., *South Indian Temple Complex*, Dharwad, 1970.
Mani, V., *Puranic Encyclopaedia*, Delhi, 1978.
Manna, S., *Mother Goddess Caṇḍī*, Calcutta, 1983.
Masson, J.M., *The Oceanic Feeling: The Origin of Religious Sentiment in Ancient India*, Dordrecht, 1980.
Mehta, M.L. and Chandra, K.R., *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, 2 vols., Ahmedabad, 1970–72.
Meister, W.M., *Discourses on Śiva*, Bombay, 1984.
Misra, K.C., *The Cult of Jagannātha*, Calcutta, 1971.
Misra, O.P., *Mother Goddess of Central India*, Delhi, 1985.
Misra, R.N., *Yakṣa Cult and Iconography*, New Delhi, 1981.
Mitchiner, J.E., *Tradition of the Seven Ṛṣis*, Delhi, 1982.
Mukherjee, A. and Khanna, Madhu, *The Tantric Way*, New York, 1977.
Morris, E.A., *Pilgrimage in the Hindu Tradition*, Delhi, 1984.
Mukhopadhyay, P.C., *Journey of the Upaniṣads to the West*, Calcutta, 1987.
Mundkur, B., *The Cult of the Serpent*, Albany, 1983.

Nagaswami, R., *Tantric Cult of South India*, Delhi, 1982.
Nakamura, H., *Indian Buddhism: A Survey of Bibliographical Notes*, Delhi, 1987.
Nandi, R.N., *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*, Delhi, 1973; 'Client, Ritual and Conflict in Early Brahmanical order' in *IHR*, VI, 1979–80, 64–129; *Social Roots of Religion of Ancient India*, Calcutta, 1986.
Nath, Vijay, *Dāna: Gift System in Ancient India*, New Delhi, 1987.
Neog, M., *Religions of the North-East*, New Delhi, 1984.
O'Flaherty, W.D., *Women, Androgynes and other Mythical Beasts*, Chicago, 1980; *Sexual Metaphors and Animal Symbols in Indian Mythology*, Delhi, 1980; *Śiva: An Erotic Ascetic, New York*, 1981; *Dreams, Illusion and other Rituals*, Delhi, 1986.
Pande, K.C. and Dwivedi, R.C., *An Outline of the History of Śaiva Philosophy*, New Delhi, 1986.
Pande, L.K., *Śaivism in Origin*, Delhi, 1985.
Pande, Susmita, *Birth of Bhakti in Indian Religion and Art*, New Delhi, 1983.
Pannikar, R.P. et al., *The Vedic Experience: Mantramañjarī*, Delhi, 1983.
Parimoo, R., ed., *Vaiṣṇavism in Indian Art and Culture*, New Delhi, 1987.
Pathak, V.S., *Smārta Religious Tradition*, Meerut, 1987.
Plott, J.C., *Philosophy of Devotion*, Delhi, 1974.
Rahula, T., *A Critical Study of the Mahāvastu*, Delhi, 1978.
Ram, R., *History of Buddhism in Nepal*, Delhi, 1978.
Ramanujam, A.K., *Speaking of Śiva*, Harmondsworth, 1985.
Rawson, P., *The Art of Tantra*, London, 1973.
Rendel, P., *Introduction to the Cakras*, Northamptonshire, 1974.
Sahai, B., *Iconography of the Minor Hindu and Buddhist Deities*, Delhi, 1975.
Sakhane, M.R., *History and Philosophy of the Liṅgāyat Religion*, Dharwad, 1978.
Sarasvati, V., *Vedic Concept of God*, Delhi, 1983.
Saroja, G.V., *Tilak and Śaṅkara on the Gītā*, New Delhi, 1985.
Sastri, G.N., *Vedic Literature*, Calcutta, 1982.
Satya Sarva, *Comprehensive History of Vedic Literature*, Delhi, 1977.
Sen, M., *Cultural Study of the Niśītha Cūrṇi*, Delhi, 1975.
Sen, S., *The Great Goddess in Indian Tradition*, Calcutta, 1983.

Sen, Majumdar, G., *Buddhism in Ancient Bengal*, Calcutta, 1983.
Settar, S., *Inviting Death*, Dharwar, 1986.
— and Sontheimer, G.D., *Memorial Stones: A Study of Their Origin, Significance and Variety*, Dharwar, 1982.
Shah, N.J., *Jain Philosophical Tracts*, Ahmedabad, 1974.
Sharma, Krishna, *Bhakti and Bhakti Movement: A New Perspective*, New Delhi, 1987.
Sharma, B.N., *Iconography of Revanta*, New Delhi, 1975.
Sharma, R.N., *Culture and Civilization as Recorded in the Śrauta Sūtras*, Delhi, 1977.
Sheridan, D.P., *The Advaitic Theism of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, New Delhi, 1986.
Shrimali, K.M., ed., *Essays in Indian Art, Religion and Society*, New Delhi, 1987.
Shriyan, R., *A Critical Study of the Mahāpurāṇa of Puṣpadanta.*, Ahmedabad, 1970.
Shulmann, D.D., *Tamil Temple Myths*, Princeton, 1980.
Siddhantasastree, R.K., *Śaivism Through the Ages*, New Delhi, 1975; *Vaiṣṇavism Through the Ages*, New Delhi, 1985.
Siddhatissa, H., *Buddhist Ethics*, London, 1970; *The Buddhist Way*, London, 1971.
Silburn, L., *Kuṇḍalinī: The Energy of the Depths*, Albany, 1988.
Singh, R., *Jain Conception of Omniscience*, Ahmedabad, 1974; *Jain Perspective in Philosophy and Religion*, Varanasi, 1983.
Singh, R.B.P., *Jainism in Early Medieval Karnataka*, Delhi, 1975.
Sinha, B.C., *Serpent Worship in Ancient India*, New Delhi, 1979; *Tree Worship in Ancient India*, New Delhi, 1979; *Hinduism and Symbol Worship*, Delhi, 1983.
Sinha, J.N., *Schools of Śaivism*, Calcutta, 1970.
Sinha, K., *Kārttikeya in Indian Art and Literature*, Delhi, 1979.
Solis, P., *The Kṛṣṇa Saga in the Purāṇas*, Delhi, 1984.
Srivastava, V.C., *Sun-worship in Ancient India*, Allahabad, 1972.
Staal, F., *Agni: The Vedic Ritual of Fire*, Delhi, 1984.
Tewari, S.P., *Hindu Iconography*, Delhi, 1979.
Thite, G.V., *Sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇa Texts*, Poona, 1975.
Tukol, T.K., *Sallekhanā is not Suicide*, Ahmedabad, 1976.
Upadhyaya, K.N., *Early Buddhism and Bhagavadgītā*, Delhi, 1971.
Varenne, J., *Le religion Vedique* (in Enc. de pleiade Hist. des Reb.), Paris, 1970.

Vesci, M., *Heat and Sacrifice in the Vedas*, Delhi, 1985.
Vijailaksmy, R., *A Study of Civakacintāmaṇi*, Ahmedabad, 1981.
Vyas, R.N., *The Bhāgavata Bhakti Cult*, Delhi, 1977.
Walker, B., *Tantrism*, Wellingborough, 1982.
Warder, A.K., *Indian Buddhism*, New Delhi, 1970.
Wayman, A., *Yoga of the Guhyasamāja Tantra*, Delhi, 1977.
White, J., ed., *Kuṇḍalinī: Evolution and Enlightenment*, New York, 1979.

Index

Abegg, E. 233
Abhedananda 68n
Abrahamsen, M.G. 83
Abs, Jos. 237
Achan, A.P. 203
Achintya, Svami 65n
Adikaram 152
Agashé, K.S. 42n, 62, 63 and n
Agrawala, P.K. 331, 367, 369
Agrawala, R.C. 146n, 298, 357
Agrawala, V.S. 237, 257, 280, 303n, 304, 327n, 328 and n, 330, 335
Ahir, D.C. 144
Ahmed, N. 147
Ainslie, W. 315
Aiyangar, H.R.R. 104
Aiyangar, S.K. 178n, 300
Aiyappan, A. 144
Aiyar, M.K.V. 284n
Aiyar, K.N.S. 6n, 233
Aiyar, P.S. 258
Aiyar, V.N. 226
Aiyar, V.V.S. 230
Akanuma, C. 99
Alabaster, H. 108n, 122
Allchin, B. 14n
Allchin, F.R. 20n
Allen, B.C. 6n
Alexander, P.C. 144
Alsdorf, L. 130n, 164n, 167 and n
Alvialla, E.C. d' 342n
Alwis, T.D. 94, 122
Anakuma, C. 112, 372
Anand, M.R. 311n
Anderson, D. 95n, 209, 371
Anesaki, M. 112, 372
Anirvan, 86n, 257
Ansari, Z.D. 20n, 21n
Appasamy, A.J. 284n
Apte, N.R. 68n
Apte, V.M. 80, 257, 261–62, 329
Aravamuthan, T.G. 365n
Arbmann, E. 76, 295n
Arnold, E.V. 30 and n, 210, 215
Arora, U.P. 88
Arrowsmith, R. 30n
Aryan, K.C. 367, 369
Aryan, S. 367
Asthana, S. 19n
Atkins, A.G. 230
Atkins, S.D. 76
Atkinson, E.T. 6n
Atre, S. 15n, 323
Atreya, B.L. 259
Atri, C.M. 356
Aufrecht, Th. 27n, 39, 40 and n
Aung, S.Z. 96
Aurobindo, Sri 78, 88, 205, 217, 320
Aurora, R.K. 238
Avalon, A. 65, 310
Awasthi, A.B.L. 237
Ayyangar, M.S.R. 170
Ayyangar, R.S. 178, 181, 316

Bagchi, P.C. 12n, 105n, 112, 138, 176, 259–60, 263, 313, 317n, 372
Bagchi, S.G. 322
Bagchi, Y.N. 259
Bahulkar, S.S. 156
Bailey, H.W. 198
Baillie, D.C. 6n
Baijnath, R.B.L. 250
Bajpai, K.D. 144, 355–56
Ballantyne, J.R. 196n
Ballini, A. 166n, 168n
Bang, W. 116
Banerjea, J.N. 147, 256, 260, 262–63, 267, 289, 295n, 297, 326, 334n, 335, 351–52, 358–61, 366–67, 369n
Banerjee, A.C. 84, 154
Banerjee, B. 106
Banerjee, P. 268–69, 356

Banerji, A. 352, 356
Banerji, R.D. 13, 145, 326, 328n, 347n
Banerji, S.C. 84n, 321, 324
Banerji-Sastri, A. 352
Bapat, P.V. 98, 141, 258
Bareau, A. 111n, 127n, 132, 142
Bargaigne, A. 30n, 31, 35 and n
Barnet Kempers, A.J. 352
Barnett, L.D. 50, 163, 172, 210, 255
Barodia, U.N. 162, 172
Barrett, D. 145n, 353
Barrett, L.R.C. 36n, 79
Barth, A. 214n, 220, 232n, 247–48, 256, 271, 307, 308n, 328, 337
Barua, A. 95n
Barua, B.K. 144
Barua, B.M. 69, 113n, 145n, 173, 176
Barua, D.K. 149, 151
Baruah, W. 101n
Basak, R.G. 101n, 141
Basavaradhya, N. 190
Basham, A.L. 173–74
Bastian, A. 171
Basu, A. 259, 302
Basu, J. 85
Basu, M. 321, 324
Basu, R. 135
Basu, R.C. 170
Basu, S.C. 64
Bäumer, B. 89
Baumgartner, A. 228
Bazaz, P.N. 222
Beal, S. 111n, 112, 127, 341n
Beane, W.C. 321
Bechardas, 163
Bechert, H. 120, 130n, 152
Badekar, V.M. 327n
Beglei, L.F. 6n
Begley, W.E. 363
Bell, C. 109 and n
Belvalkar, S.K. 70–71, 215, 219, 222n, 258
Bendal, C. 100, 103, 104
Benfy, Th. 40, 371
Beni Prasad 182
Bennet, C. 122
Benveniste, E. 33, 34n, 73
Berezovsky, M. 115
Bergman, B. 108n
Bernard, T. 316
Bernhard, F. 120
Bertholet, A. 255
Besant, A. 210, 217
Beurlen, W. 180n
Beyer, G. 314n
Bhadekar, R.D. 98
Bhadkamkar, H.M. 64
Bhagat, N. 98
Bhagavata, R.R. 64–65
Bhagowalia, Urmila 294
Bhandari, V.S. 303n
Bhandarkar, D.R. 14n, 145, 296, 349
Bhandarkar, R.G. 61, 159, 166, 173, 202, 211, 214, 220, 233n, 264, 274–78, 282n, 296–98, 301, 303, 328, 331, 332
Bharadvaja, K. 238
Bharadwaj, S.M. 339n
Bharati, A. 310n, 311, 316, 319
Bharati, P. 206
Bhargava, D. 189
Bhargava, P.L. 83
Bhat, M.S. 90
Bhatt, G.H. 259
Bhatta, M. 190
Bhattacharjee, S.S. 87
Bhattacharyya, A. 260
Bhattacharyya, B. 289, 295n, 306
Bhattacharyya, B.C. 326, 328n, 348, 350–51, 355, 359, 369n
Bhattacharyya, B.N. 260
Bhattacharyya, B.T. 105, 106, 137, 139, 258, 260, 308, 313n, 314n, 326, 346 and n, 353, 359, 369n
Bhattacharyya, D.C. 147 and n, 258, 314n, 354, 360
Bhattacharyya, D.M. 79
Bhattacharyya, H. 179, 188, 326
Bhattacharyya, H.D. 76, 257, 259, 262, 329
Bhattacharyya, H.M. 259
Bhattacharyya, J.V. 259
Bhattacharyya, K. 321
Bhattacharyya, K.C. 259

Bhattacharyya, K.L. 327, 369n
Bhattacharyya, N.N. 14n, 15n, 17n, 75n, 85, 87, 127n, 192, 284n
Bhattacharyya, S. 318n, 331
Bhattacharyya, S.A. 284n
Bhattacharyya, S.B. 281
Bhattacharyya, S.N. 259
Bhattacharyya, S.P. 260
Bhattacharyya, T.P. 325
Bhattacharyya, U.C. 262
Bhattacharyya, V. 103, 105n
Bhattacharyya, V.S. 258
Bhattasali, N.K. 326, 328n, 347, 351, 359, 369n
Bhave, V. 217n
Bhayani, H.C. 167n, 189
Bidoli, M. 89
Bigandet, P. 108n, 121, 133
Biswal, B. 306
Biswas, D.K. 128n, 329
Blackburn, R. 5n
Blair, C. 85
Blake, V. 31
Blavatski, M. 91
Blau, A. 232 and n, 233
Bloch, Jules 12
Bloch, T. 146–47, 341n
Bloomfield, J.H. 5n
Bloomfield, M. 30n, 31 and n, 34, 35, 36, 37, 41, 52n, 53, 73, 79, 161n, 165 and n, 166n, 175, 328
Boele, J.J. 353
Bohn, 172
Böhtlingk, O. 46n, 48, 94n, 371
Bollensen, 360
Bonnerjea, B. 12 and n
Bongard Levin, G.M. 93n, 115n, 116n
Bool Chand 182
Bopp, F. 28, 210n, 370
Borough, 120
Bose, A.N. 259
Bose, D. 223
Bose, D.N. 319
Bose, G.C. 235
Bose, M.M. 137
Bose, N.K. 22–23
Bose, R.C. 68n
Bose, S.C. 7n
Bothra, P. 193
Bouta, R.J.D. 356
Boxberger, P. 211
Bower, Colonel 113
Brahmaswamy, B.S. 64
Bray, D. 6n
Bregenhoj, C. 83
Briffault, R. 151
Briggs, G.W. 6n
Broadly, A.M. 146
Brocklington, J.L. 231
Brookly, 201n
Broomfield, J. 5n
Brown, C.M. 238
Brown, J. Cogsin 1n
Brown, N. 86, 87n
Bruhn, K. 357
Brune 29, 30n, 40
Brunnhofer 33
Buck, C.H. 7n
Bucknell, R.S. 156
Buddhadatta, A.P. 95n, 97
Bühler, G. 37n, 55n, 159–60, 162, 173, 197n, 232, 233n, 273, 295, 349, 372
Bulcke, C. 230
Burgess, J. 145n, 146, 165, 171 and n, 341n, 349
Burgess, M.S. 164n, 165
Burlingame, 97
Burn, R. 6n
Burnell, A.C. 40, 42n, 214
Burnouf, E. 27, 31n, 46, 62, 92n, 93, 94, 100, 101, 108, 118, 119, 121, 132, 133, 233, 272, 373

Caleb, C.C. 211
Caillet, C. 193
Caland, W. 35n, 36, 40, 41, 42n, 55 and n
Caldwell, Bishop, 11, 12
Campbell, J. 6n, 8n
Cappaller, C. 101n
Carelli, M.E. 106
Carpenter, J.E. 95n, 211, 254
Canurvedi, N. 144
Chakko, J.C. 203

Chakravarti, A.C. 209, 280
Chakravarti, C. 83, 296n, 318n, 319, 324
Chakravarti, C.M. 260
Chakravarti, Dilip K. 1n
Chakravarti, H.P. 296n
Chakravarti, N. 306, 361
Chakravarti, N.P. 114n
Chakravarti, P.C. 317
Chakravarti, S.C. 84n, 370
Chakravarti, Uma 151–52
Chakravartinayanar, A. 167
Challey, J. 3n
Chalmers, R. 95n, 97
Chambers, W. 93
Champakalakshmi, R. 363
Chanana, D.R. 315n
Chand, B. 180n, 182, 185
Chanda, R.P. 13 and n, 14n, 15 and n, 16 and n, 23, 145n, 147, 188, 285–86, 312, 350
Chandra, G.C. 146–47
Chandra, K.K. 194
Chandra, K.R. 189
Chandra, L. 109, 317, 355
Chandrasekharan, K. 230
Chang, C.Y. 314n
Chang, G.C.C. 135, 314n
Chardin, T. 18
Charpentier, J. 164–65, 172, 175n, 203, 219, 261, 289, 295n
Chatterjee, A.K. 135, 194, 331
Chatterjee, Bankim Chandra 59–61, 66n, 200, 201 and n, 205–06, 220, 308
Chatterjee, B.R. 258
Chatterjee, D. 111n
Chatterjee, J.C. 48, 301
Chatterjee, R.M. 310
Chatterjee, S.C. 256
Chatterji, S.K. 12 and n, 13n, 231, 236, 261, 289, 314, 332
Chattopadhyaya, Alaka, 108n, 110
Chattopadhyaya, D.P. 15n, 17 and n, 23–25, 82, 149, 313, 320, 333, 334
Chattopadhyaya, K.C. 75
Chattopadhyaya, S. 297, 353
Chau, T.M. 111n, 153
Chaudhuri, B.M. 143, 204
Chaudhuri, N. 329
Chaudhuri, N.M. 203, 289, 295n
Chaudhuri, N.N. 105, 327n
Chaudhuri, P.C. 144
Chaudhuri, R. 259
Chaudhuri, S. 136, 144n
Chavannes, E 112
Chawla, J. 360
Cheever, M. 323
Chézy, A.L. 27n
Chi, R.S.Y. 136
Chidanandamurti, M. 190n
Childe, V.G. 14 and n
Chip-P'an 153
Childers, R.C. 94, 96n, 133, 371
Chimpa Lama, 110
Chinmulgund, P.J. 1n
Chitale, M.P. 221
Choudhuri, Usha 89
Chowdhuri, G.B. 184n
Chowdhury, S.N. 146n
Christensen, A. 34n
Clark, W.E. 314n, 347n
Clothey, F.W. 331n, 367n
Clough, B. 93 and n, 371
Coburn, T. 238, 323
Coedes, G. 153
Coggin Brown, J. 1n
Cole, H.H. 145, 342n
Colebrooke, H.T. 27, 45 and n, 62, 158, 159n, 241 and n, 272, 370
Conze, E. 92, 102n, 111n, 117, 134, 142n, 353, 373
Coomaraswamy, A.K. 74–75, 243n, 317, 327n, 328n, 329, 334–35, 343n, 347 and n, 348–49, 360, 365, 366, 368
Cordier, P. 108 and n
Courtright, P.B. 335
Cousens, H. 145 and n
Cowell, E.B. 42n, 45n, 46, 101, 115 196n
Cox, A.P. 6n
Crooke, W. 7n, 332
Culalankarana 97
Cumont, F. 76, 88
Cunningham, A. 145 and n, 146, 147n 341, 342n, 348

Curtius, E. 348

Dahlmann, J. 133 and n, 197n, 198, 202, 220, 226
Dalal, C.D. 160n, 166, 296
Dalal, C.M. 184
Dalal, J. 6n
Dalton, E.T. 6n
Dandekar, R.N. 71–72, 76 and n, 88, 258, 289, 303n
Dange, S.A. 76, 84, 88, 238, 334 and n
Dange, Sindhu S. 77, 84
Dani, A.H. 20n, 145
Daniel, Smith H. 362
Danielou, A. 266–67, 316, 333
Danuvila, K. 306
Dara Sukoh, 45
Dargway, E. 155
Darling, G.J. 156
Darmestater, J. 33, 34n
Das, A.C. 67
Das, B. 207 and n, 211
Das, C.R. 292
Das, S.C. 101, 109–10, 136, 137, 372
Das, S.K. 317
Das, S.R. 147
Das, T.C. 260, 329
Das, U.K. 318n
Dasa, B. 231
Dash, M.P. 356
Dasgupta, D.C. 182
Dasgupta, H.C. 1n
Dasgupta, K.K. 347n
Dasgupta, M. 279, 289
Dasgupta, N.N. 139, 144n, 262
Dasgupta, P.C. 357
Dasgupta, S.B. 139, 260, 318
Dasgupta, S.N. 16, 69–70, 79, 177–78, 187, 237, 297, 300, 316, 319
Dass, B. 171–72
Datta, A.K. 57, 61
Datta, D.M. 259
Datta, K. 361
Datta, K.N. 236
Dattaray, R.V. 86n
Davane, G.V. 326n, 369n
Davi, K.N. 78
Davis, J. 210
Dayananda, 88
Dawa Samdup, 111n
De, B. 357
De, D.L. 289
De, H.N. 110
De, G.D. 149
De, S.C. 230
De, S.K. 204, 219, 288, 289, 292, 330
De, Sudhin 357
De Silva, G. 97
Delamaine, 159n
Demieville, P. 112 and n
Deo, S.B. 20n, 185–86
Desai, G.H. 6n
Desai, Kalpana 363
Desai, M. 217n
Desai, M.D. 184
Desai, N.Y. 238
Desai, P.B. 185, 302
Desai, S.M. 192
Desai, V.G. 217n
Deshmukh, P.S. 80
Desideri, I. 107
Dessigana, R. 367
Deshpande, M. 13n
Deshpande, M.H. 145n
Deshpande, N.A. 239
Deussen, P. 36, 39 and n, 44, 47–53, 197n, 202, 211–12, 220
Deutsch, E. 215
Devasthali, G.V. 85
Devirappa, H. 190
Dey, M.C. 145n
Dhaky, M.A. 357–58
Dhal, U.N. 327, 368
Dhalke, P. 94n, 96n, 134
Dhar, L. 202
Dharmapala, A. 97
Dharmaratna, U. 149
Dhavalikar, M.K. 21n
Dhavamony, M. 284n
Dikshit, K.K. 187, 189, 192, 194
Dikshit, K.N. 147 and n
Dikshit, M.G. 146
Dikshit, S.K. 222n, 312

Dikshitar, V.R.R. 204, 233, 234–35, 300, 318
Dickson, S. 94
Din, M.M. 6n
Dinanatha, R.C. 166
Divakara, S.C. 183n
Divanji, P.C. 220, 222n, 297
Diwan Chand 221
Dixit, V.V. 208, 226
Doraisingaswamy, M.A. 300
Doshi, J.G. 164n
Douglas, N. 311n, 316
Dow, A. 240
Dowson, J. 200, 243 and n
Drury, N. 85
Dube, S.N. 131
Dubois, Abbe 4
Dubreuil, J. 345, 351, 359
Dumezil, G. 8, 73–74, 88
Dumont, P.E. 80, 84, 329
Dumoulin, H. 153
Dunuvila, R.A. 306
Durga Prasad 64–65
Durkheim, E. 8 and n, 82
Dutt, M.N. 209n, 226, 232
Dutt, N. 93n, 100, 101n, 102, 110, 129, 131, 132n, 144, 258, 261
Dutt, R.C. 61, 209n, 227
Dutt, S. 141, 149, 152
Dwivedi, 191, 306, 358

Eckel, D. 155
Eckhart, M. 53
Edgerton, F. 36n, 38 and n, 39, 52, 120 and n, 121, 135, 175, 211, 371
Edmunds, A.S. 94n
Eek, Diana 323
Eggeling, J. 42n
Ehrenfels, O.R. 14n, 16, 17n, 312
Eklund, J.A. 133 and n
Ekstein, B.D. 45n
Eliade, M. 68, 73 and n, 87, 310 and n, 311, 316
Eliot, C. 199, 232n, 253–54, 308
Elmore, W.T. 7n
Elsingh, H.F. 42n
Endle, S. 6n
Enthoven, R.E. 6n
Erskine, K.D. 6n
Eschmann, A. 293
Evans-Wentz, W.Y. 138–39
Ewing, A.H. 50

Fabri 146
Faddegon, B. 211
Fairservis, W.A. 14n
Falk, M. 125
Farquhar, J.N. 211, 215, 225, 233, 251, 299, 328
Fauche, H. 210n, 227n
Fausböll, V. 94, 95 and n, 122, 200, 243
Feer, L. 94n, 95n, 101, 122
Felber, E. 41
Fergusson, J. 146, 336, 341n, 348
Feuerstein, G. 224
Fey, J. 82
Fick, R. 149, 165
Field, R. 154
Fifford, B. 182
Filippi, F.B 107n, 167
Filliozat, J. 114n
Finot, L. 97n, 102, 103n, 114
Fleet, J.F. 233, 298
Florenz, C.A. 37
Foote, R.B. 1 and n
Formichi, C. 101n, 209
Foucaux, Ph. E. 101n, 121, 210n
Foucher, A. 145n, 332, 334n, 342, 343 and n, 348, 368
Foulkes, Th. 272
Francis, W. 6n
Francklin, W. 158
Franke, R.O. 94, 96n, 98, 118n, 123, 127n
Frankfürter, 133
Frauwallner, E. 104, 111n, 119, 180n
Frazer, J.G. 2n, 8n, 328
Freud, S. 8n
Friedlander, 44n
Friedrich, 227, 341n
Frobenius 2
Führer, A. 147

Gabain, A. Von 116
Gabet 111
Gadre, A.S. 145n, 146
Gail, A. 279
Gail, E.A. 6n
Gajendragadkar, K.V. 260
Ganapati, V. 90, 363
Gandhi, L.B. 167n
Gandhi, M. 216–17 and n, 218 and n, 265–66
Gandhi, V.C. 174
Gangadharan, N. 239
Ganguli, H.K. 136
Ganguli, K.K. 355
Ganguli, K.M. 209n
Gangoly, O.C. 324, 345, 349, 359
Gangopadhyaya, M.K. 111n
Ganhar, G.N. 144n
Ganhar, P.N. 144n
Garbe, R. 16 and n, 36, 43, 48, 51, 52, 55n, 79, 199, 202, 211–12, 214, 220, 288
Garr, B.L. 175
Garrat, G.T. 3n
Garrison, O. 311n, 319
Gastra, D. 42n
Gauthoti, R. 114, 116
Geden, A.S. 47n, 48, 308
Gehman, 96
Geiger, W. 96n, 98, 99
Geldner, K.F. 29 and n, 30n, 31, 35, 36, 73, 87, 328
Gentz, F.V. 210
Georgi, A. 107
Gerrasio, G. 227n
Gertsenberg, L. 116
Getty, A. 137, 314n, 326, 333, 334n, 342, 347n, 359, 365–66, 369n
Ghatage, A.M. 262
Ghate 67
Gheyn, V.D. 214n
Ghosh, A. 1n, 19n, 145n, 358
Ghosh, A.B. 259, 309, 317
Ghosh, B.K. 34n, 45, 76, 98, 233n, 261
Ghosh, I.C. 98n
Ghosh, J.C. 203
Ghosh, K.C. 174
Ghosh, Mallar 355
Ghosh, N. 368
Ghosh, N.N. 226
Ghosh, R. 102
Ghoshal, S.C. 169
Ghoshal, U.N. 110
Ghurye, G.S. 83
Gibson, A.C. 341n
Giles, H.A. 111n
Gladstone, M.S. 76
Glasenapp, H.V. 138–39, 165, 179, 182, 232n, 256, 317, 372
Godage, C. 152
Godikumbura 95n
Goddard, D. 134
Gode, P.K. 209, 221n, 369n
Goetz, H. 313
Gogerly 133
Gokhale, B.G. 145
Gokhale, L.R. 220
Gokhale, V.V. 156
Gombrich, R.F. 87
Gonda, J. 73, 76, 82, 84, 88, 279, 290, 322n
Gooneratne, F.R. 95n, 96n
Gopal, R. 82
Gorakhsekhar, S. 355n
Gordon, A.K. 314n, 347n, 359
Gore, N.N. 226
Goswami, B.B. 339n
Goswami, B.K. 278
Goswami, K.G. 291
Goswami, S.L. 65
Gotshalk, A. 224
Goudrian, T. 322
Gough, A.E. 47, 295
Govinda, L.A. 140
Govindacharya, A. 287n
Govindacharya, Swami 288
Gowar, R. 369
Goyal, S.R. 269–70
Graebner, F. 2 and n, 10
Grassmann, H.G. 29n, 30n, 77, 369
Grierson, G.A. 197n, 202, 212, 214, 250, 274, 277, 342
Griffith, J. 145n
Griffith, R.T.H. 29n, 37, 41n, 227
Griffith, W.G. 12n

Grill, J. 37
Grimbolt, P. 94
Grimm, G. 134
Grisword, H.D. 48
Grover, Usha 91
Grünwedel, A. 113, 137, 341, 343n, 348
Gruppa 34n
Gubernatis 31
Guenther, H.V. 134, 139, 140, 154, 317, 370
Guerinot, A. 158, 160n, 169, 180
Guha, B.S. 10
Gune, P.D. 166, 167n, 221
Gupta, A.S. 326n, 369n
Gupta, B.A. 334n
Gupta, R.C. 357
Gupta, R.S. 145n, 354, 359
Gupta, S. 322, 327
Gupta, S.D. 160n
Gupta, S.K. 334, 338
Gupta, S.M. 362n, 363
Gupta, S.P. 21n
Gupta, B.A. 7
Gurdon, P.T. 6n

Haas, E. 51, 55
Habib, I. 279n
Hacker, M.F. 49 and n
Hadaway, W.S. 356
Haldar, A. 93n
Halder, A.K. 145n
Halder, H.L. 319
Hale, E.W. 90
Hamid, M. 145n
Hamilton-Buchanan, F. 93n, 159
Hamsraj H. 166 and n
Handique, K.K. 183, 258, 296, 298
Handoo, C.K. 260
Hanmann, G.J. 31
Hans Raj 76
Hara, Erik 140
Hardy, E. 31n, 42, 95n
Hardy, F. 282, 339
Hardy, S.H. 6n
Hare, E.M. 95n, 96, 99, 371
Hargreaves, H. 17, 18, 147, 328n, 342n
Hariramaja, K.V. 65n
Harold, A.F. 48
Harrison, J.E. 2n, 32
Harrison, M.H. 142
Hariyappa, H.L. 76
Hartel 114
Hartland, E.S. 8n
Hartman, C.G. 320
Hartmann, G. 327
Hass, G.C. 51
Hassnain, F.M. 144n
Haug, Martin 42n
Hauer, J.W. 133
Haughton 241
Hauvette, Besnault 232n
Havell, E.B. 145n, 328n, 343n
Hawley, J.S. 323n
Hazra, R.C. 235–36, 258, 303n, 329
Healy, S.H. 6n
Hecker 50n
Heestermann, J.C. 82
Hegel, 47, 210
Held, G. 8
Held, G.J. 202
Heller, F. 54n
Hemingway, P.R. 6n
Henry, V. 35n, 36n, 37, 38 and n, 55, 370
Heras, H. 13n, 14n, 333–34
Herbert, J. 365n
Herodotus 33, 206
Hertel, J. 51–52, 65–66n, 167, 210n
Herzefild, E. 34n
Hessig, W. 154
Hevsey, W. 12
Hewavitarane, S. 97
Hikata 102
Hill, W.D.P. 215
Hillebrandt, A. 29 and n, 30n, 31n, 33, 34n, 35 and n, 40, 41, 51, 55 and n, 81, 212, 328
Hindi, B.D. 190
Hindrey, R. 136
Hingorani, A.T. 218n
Hingorani, R.P. 349n, 357
Hira Lal 6n, 160n
Hiranaka 129n
Hiremath, R.C. 190

Hiriyanna, M. 215, 259
Hodson, T.C. 6n
Hodgson, B.H. 99–101, 121, 341n, 343n
Hodivala, S.K. 328
Hodous, L. 112
Hoernle, A.F.R. 113–16, 161–63, 172–73, 372
Hoey, W. 124, 320
Höfinger, M. 129–30
Hoffmann, 154, 156
Hohenberger, A. 234
Hoisington, H.R. 272n
Holme, E. 134
Holmes, W.H.G. 54n
Holtzmann, A. 165, 197n, 198, 210 and n, 212, 220, 225, 233 and n
Holwell, J.Z. 240 and n
Hook, P.E. 13n
Hooke, S.H. 32
Hopkins, E.W. 50n, 54, 123, 197n, 198, 200, 206n, 211–12, 214, 220, 225–28, 232n, 233, 243, 247–48, 256, 271, 279, 295, 307, 308n, 316n, 326, 328, 336
Hopkins, J. 140
Horner, I.B. 93n, 95 and n, 97
Houtart, F. 338
Howells, J. 214
Howard, W. 90
Hubert, H. 8, 55
Huc, F. 94n, 111
Hugo 91
Hull, R.F.C. 311n, 317n
Hultzsch, E. 170n, 178n
Humboldt, W.V. 28, 210–11, 220
Hume, D. 3i
Hume, R.E. 51–53
Hunt, M. 95n
Hunter, G.R. 19n
Hunter, W.W. 3
Huth, G. 113
Huttemann, O. 163
Hutton, J. 11
Hutton, J.H. 6n
Huxley, A. 216

Ibbetson, D.C. 76n
Indraji, B.L. 145n
Ingalls, D.H. 298
Inoue 112, 372
Isherwood, C. 216
Iyangar, H.S. 184, 190
Iyangar, M.A.R. 184
Iyengar, P.T. Srinivasa 12, 13n
Iyengar, S.K. 287 and n
Iyer, C.N. Narayana 300
Iyer, L.K.A.K. 6n
Iyer, S. 365n
Iyer, V.V. 208

Jacob, G.A. 48
Jacobi, H. 13, 14n, 50, 66, 68, 159–60, 162–63 and n, 164–67 and n, 168 and n, 170 and n, 171, 180n, 182, 197n, 199, 211, 213, 227 and n, 228–29, 372
Jacobson, J. 19n
Jackson, 147, 233
Jain, B.C. 189, 357
Jain, B.D. 165
Jain, C.L. 160n, 169
Jain, C.R. 174–75, 179 and n
Jain, H.L. 167n, 183n, 258
Jain, J.C. 182, 183 and n, 184n, 188–89, 194–95
Jain, J.P. 188
Jain, K.P. 183n, 188
Jain, L.R. 165
Jain, M.C. 172
Jain, N. 356
Jain, P.D. 184n
Jain, U.K. 191
Jaini, J.L. 168, 174 and n, 179, 180n
Jaiswal, S. 215, 223n, 280, 291
James, E.O. 22n, 320n
Jan-Yun-Hua 145n, 153
Jash, P. 299, 305, 332
Jastrow 8n
Javaregauda, D. 190
Jayantavijaya 164n
Jayasundaram 96n
Jayaswal, K.P. 148, 350, 352
Jayawickrama 96, 152
Jevons, F.V. 2n

Jha, D.N. 223n, 339n
Jha, G.N. 104, 259, 316n
Jha, M. 339n
Jha, R.C. 135
Jha, V. 224
Jhaveri, K.M. 207
Jhaveri, M.B. 179, 182, 317n
Jhaveri, M.L. 172
Jinavijaya, 162n, 164n, 170, 182, 183n
Johnson, H.M. 350
Johnston, C. 47n
Johnston, E.H. 101n
Jolly, J. 197n, 232, 233n
Jones, J.J. 101n
Jones, R. 78
Jones, W. 3, 27, 45, 241–42
Jong, J.W.de 92, 155
Joshi, C.V. 98n
Joshi, J.R. 88
Joshi, L.M. 135n, 142, 195
Joshi, N.P. 356, 367
Joshi, R.B. 263
Julien, St. 111, 127
Jung, C.G. 8n, 73, 311n, 316

Kaegi, A. 29, 30n
Kajiama, 111n
Kak, R.C. 146
Kala, B.T. 184n
Kala, S.C. 145n
Kalaghatagi, T.G. 187
Kalhatkar, Y.V. 234
Kamptz, K.V. 164, 372
Kane, P.V. 80–81, 236, 279, 320, 329, 334, 339
Kant, E. 52–54, 134
Kapadia, H.R. 160n, 162, 182
Kapur, T. 338
Karambelkar, V.W. 81, 329
Karandikar, J.S. 229
Karmarkar, A.P. 203, 256, 258, 289, 295n, 296
Karve, I. 203
Kasahara, K. 112, 372
Kashikar 79
Kasyapa, J. 98 and n
Katisesu, M. 300
Katre, S.L. 204, 237, 289
Kaul, H.K. 6n
Kausalyayana, A. 98n
Kaviraj, G. 309–10, 318n, 324
Keep, A.E. 353
Keith, A.B. 30 and n, 32, 35, 36n, 38, 41 and n, 42 and n, 43, 44 and n, 45n, 52 and n, 53, 55 and n, 56, 76, 81, 87, 118n, 133n, 177, 211, 214n, 233, 261, 370
Kelkar, N.C. 203
Kennedy, J. 96, 200, 202, 242, 243n, 288, 332
Kennedy, V. 231, 326
Keny, L.B. 289
Kerbaker, M. 209
Kern, J.H.C. 101 and n, 115, 123, 124n, 127, 148, 173, 336
Kerenyi, K. 73n
Kesavan, V. 223n, 339
Ketker, S. 49n
Khair, G.S. 223
Khan, B. 230
Khan, F.A. 147
Khan, I. 325, 327, 369n
Khosla, S. 144n
Kielhorn, F. 37n
Kimura, R. 131n
Kinjawadikar, R. 225
Kingsbury, P. 300
Kinsley, D. 321, 323
Kirfel, W. 35, 163, 166n, 204, 219, 234, 295n, 353
Kittel, F. 295
Kittima, B. 92n
Klatt, J. 159, 161, 167
Klementz, D. 113
Knauer, F. 55n
Knipe, D. 85
Koliya, K. 97
Kolmas, J. 93n
Kondo, 101n
Konow, S. 30, 111n, 114n, 116, 147, 255 and n
Kopf, D. 4, 5n
Kopp 95
Köppen, C.F. 122, 133, 137, 148

Koros, A.C. de 107, 109, 121, 372
Kosambi, D.D. 14n, 24, 77, 82, 95n, 97, 98 and n, 150, 208, 215, 222, 223n, 225, 280
Kramrisch, S. 326
Krause, C. 166, 178, 180n, 185
Krempelhuber, M.K. 45n
Krishna, N. 363
Krishnacharya, 104, 235
Krishnamurtisarma, B.N. 221n
Krishnasastri, H. 328, 349, 351
Krishnaswami, V.D. 1n
Kriste, 197n
Krotkov 115
Kuang, C.H. 153
Kuiper, K.B.J. 12 and n
Kühn, A. 31 and n
Kulkarni, B.S. 190
Kulke, H. 293
Kumar, K.S. 238
Kumar, P. 321
Kumar, R. 193
Kumarappa, B. 255
Kumarswamiji 259, 302
Kundnagar, K.G. 185
Kunhan Raja, C. 257
Kuno, 114n
Kuraishi, M.H. 146
Kuroda, S. 131n

Labberton, D.V.H. 211
Lahiri, A.K. 90
Lahiri, Latika 154
Lahmann 255n
Lal, B.B. 1n
Lal, D. 165
Lalou, M. 108 and n, 128n, 353
Lalwani, K.C. 194
Lalye, P.G. 238
Lamotte, E. 111n, 119, 123, 129–30, 131
Lang, A. 8n, 10
Lang, K. 156
Langlois, S.A. 27n, 28n, 225
Lanjulnais, J.D. 45n
Lanman, C.R. 37, 47
Larson, G. 369
Lassen, C. 62, 94, 147n, 197, 227, 272, 295
Latimer, C. 6n
Latthe, A.B. 172
Law, B.C. 95, 99, 175–76, 181, 182, 258
Law, N.N. 86n
Leadbreath, C.N. 316
Le Cog, V. 113
Lecoutere, C. 202
Leeuw, J.E.L. 353–54
Lefmann, S. 101n
Legge, J.H. 111n
Leibert, G. 357
Leider, K. 142n
Leist, B.W. 55
Leitner, G.W. 342
Le Marten 91
Lessing 140
Leumann 102, 116, 159–61, 163–64, 166, 172
Levi, S. 12 and n, 36, 43, 81, 87, 101, 102, 112, 114, 116–17, 129, 132, 197n, 198, 206, 213, 313, 372
Levi Strauss, C. 72, 73n, 92
Lhalungpa, L.P. 155
Lilley, M.E. 95n
Limircinier, G. 338
Linclon, B. 83
Lindner, B. 42n
Lindtner Chr, 155–56
Ling, T.O. 142n, 144n
Littleton, S.C. 74
Loarini, E. 166
Lobbecke, R. 42n
Longhurst, 146
Lopez, D.S. 156
Lorenzen, D. 298–99
Lorenzo, G. 96n
Lorinser, F. 211, 213–14, 274–75, 276
Losch 234
Loubére S. de la, 93 and n
Luard, C.E. 6n
Lubac H de 92
Lüders, H. 37n, 76, 115, 118, 233 and n
Ludwig, A. 29n, 30n, 31n, 36, 101n, 197n, 199, 226
Lurker, M. 353

Lyall, A. 249
Lyall, A.C. 6n

Macaulay 243
Macalister, R.A.S. 22n
Macdonell, A.A. 29n, 30 and n, 31 and n, 34 and n, 35, 36n, 49, 73, 226, 326, 328, 345n, 360, 370–71
Macdonald, A.W. 128n
Macdonald, Ariane 140
Macdonald, K.S. 89
Macgregor, G.I. 6n
Mackay, E. 18 and n
Mackay, E.J.H. 14n
Mackenzie, C. 53, 158, 321
Mackenzie, Brown 299
Macnicol, N. 142, 220, 252, 281
Macquity, W. 142n
Madhavananda, S. 258
Mahadevan, T.M.P. 220, 221n, 257, 262, 264, 301
Mahadeva Sastri, A. 63
Mahajan, B.D. 145n
Mahalingam, T.V. 296
Mainkar, T.G. 79
Maise, F.C. 145n
Maitra, S.K. 222n
Majumdar, A.K. 284n, 289
Majumdar, B. 208
Majumdar, B.C. 98n, 295n
Majumdar, B.P. 297
Majumdar, J.C. 203
Majumdar, J.L. 65
Majumdar, J.N. 65
Majumdar, N.G. 18 and n, 145 and n, 147
Majumdar, R.C. 144n, 148, 259–60, 262
Malalasekera, G.P. 99, 141, 152, 189, 371
Malavaniya 104n
Malebranche, N. 91
Malhotra, K.C. 20n
Malik, S.C. 223n
Malinowsky, B. 8, 72
Malishawadi, B.B. 191
Mallmann, T. de 353–54
Malvania, D. 193
Mani, V. 238
Mankad, D.R. 235
Maratray, R. 94n
Marcault, E. 48n
Margregot, G. 5n
Markgraf, S. 94n
Marquette, J. de 78
Marret, R.R. 2n, 8n
Marshall, J. 14 and n, 15, 16 and n, 145, 146n, 147, 312, 342n
Martin, A.C. 345n
Martin, E.O. 251
Martin, J.T. 6n
Masuda, J. 128, 129n, 133
Mathur, K.S. 1n
Matilal, B.K. 193
Matsunami, S. 100
Mauss, M. 8, 55, 72
Max Müller, F. 27, 29n, 30n, 31, 34, 43, 46, 51, 54, 60, 61, 88, 94n, 102, 123, 209, 220, 244, 328, 360
Mayeda, E. 120n
Mazumdar, B.C. 236
Mazumdar, S. 230
McCartney 115
McCormack 303
McGovern, W.M. 131n, 133n
Mead, G.R. S. 48
Mead, P.J. 6n
Mehendale, M.A. 215
Mehta, J.L. 135n
Mehta, M.L. 185, 189
Metha, P.D. 256
Mehta, R.L. 353
Mehta, R.N. 297
Meinhard, H. 234
Menon, P. 238
Menrad, M. 227n
Messon-Oursel, P. 8
Meyer, J.J. 163, 165n, 234
Michalski-Icoienoki 94n
Milburn, R.G. 54 and n
Mill, J.S. 3n
Mills, J. 3
Mills, J.P. 6n
Miller, R.J. 154

Minayeff, J.P. 94, 95n, 117, 118n, 126–28, 132, 373
Mirashi, V.V. 1n, 292
Mirji, A. 191n
Mironov, N. 115, 167, 169n
Mischel, F. 45n
Misra, A.P. 284n
Misra, B.N. 146 and n, 353
Misra, G.S.P. 151
Misra, K.C. 292
Misra, O.P. 323
Misra, P. 84
Misra, R.N. 366n
Misra, V. 259
Misra, V.N. 1n, 19n, 75n
Mitchner, J.E. 89
Mitra, A. 332
Mitra, Debala, 144, 146–47, 353–55, 357
Mitra, J. 61n
Mitra, K.N. 260
Mitra, K.P. 317n
Mitra, P.K. 357
Mitra, R. 42n
Mitra, R.C. 144
Mitra, R.L. 42n, 46, 61–62, 100 and n, 102, 104 and n, 146–47, 165n, 308, 316n
Mitra, S.K. 149
Mitra, S.N. 113n
Mitra Sastri, A. 142
Mittal, J.M. 114, 234
Mizuno, K. 127n
Mode, H. 356
Modi, M.C. 189
Modi, P.M. 222n
Mody, K.P. 168 and n, 169
Mongalaba, M. 230
Monier-Williams, M. 46, 210n, 227, 232n, 244–45, 256, 271, 274, 277, 288, 307 and n, 332, 371
Montogomery, A.J. 175
Mookerjee, A. 311n, 319
Mookerjee, R.K. 259, 315n
Mookherjee, S. 258–59
Mookherjee, S.K. 182, 188
Moor, E. 158 and n, 240–41, 341
Morab, S.G. 339n
Morgan, K.W. 141, 256
Morris, E.A. 339n
Morris, R. 95n
Mugali, R.S. 182n, 191n
Muhammad, S.N. 65
Muir, J. 29n, 31, 46, 210n, 214n, 227, 272, 274, 326, 328
Mukerji, A.C. 259
Mukerjee, R.K. 259
Mukherjee, G.G. 82
Mukherjee, P. 144, 292
Mukherjee, P.C. 147n
Mukherjee, S.C. 291–92
Mukhopadhyay, P.C. 91
Mukhopadhyay, S.K. 103n
Mukhtyar, J.K. 183n, 184n
Muller, E. 95n
Muller, F.W.K. 116
Mullick, P.N. 226
Munjarpattu, R.G. 65n
Munro, T. 3
Munshi, K.M. 203, 207, 220, 222n
Murray, G. 32
Murray Mitchell, J. 250–51
Murti, T.R.V. 134, 259
Murthy, S.C. 188

Nagai, M. 98
Nagar, M. 1n
Nagaswamy, R. 322
Nahar, P.C. 174, 183n
Nahata, A.C. 356
Nagao, G.M. 103n
Nakamura, H. 143
Nanamoli, 96, 96n, 97 and n
Nanatiloka 95n, 96n, 97n, 133
Nandi, R.N. 338
Nandimath, S.C. 302–03
Nandou, J. 144n
Nanjio, B. 101 and n, 111, 112
Nanjundayya, H.V. 6n
Narahari, H. 81, 203
Narasimhachar, S.G. 184, 190
Narasimhacharya, R. 182, 190n
Narasimham, P. 219
Narasimhaswami, H.K. 296
Narain, L.A. 19n

Narayan, H. 65
Narayana, C.V. 300
Narayanan, M.G.S. 223n, 339
Natesa Sastri, S.M. 7n
Nath, R.G. 259
Nath, R.M. 259
Nath, V. 338
Navalkar, N.R. 230
Navaratnam, K. 367n
Navaratnam, R. 331
Nawal, M.S. 350
Nayak, G.C. 156
Nazim, M. 146–47
Needham, J. 314
Negelin, Julius 228
Neil, 115n
Neil, R.A. 101
Nelson, A.E. 6n
Nene, G.S. 63–64
Neog, M. 293
Neogi, P. 339
Neufeldt, R.W. 88
Neumann, C.J. 111
Neumann, E. 73n, 320n
Neumann, K.E. 94n, 96n
Neve, F. 31n, 274
Nihsreyasananda, 259
Nilakantha Sastri, K.A. 254, 263, 264, 297n, 300
Norman 95n
Nyaungyan, S. 97

Obermiller, E. 102, 109, 111n, 129
Obry 133 and n
Oertel, F.O. 147
O' Flaherty, W.D. 8n, 89, 304 and n
Ohira, S. 195
Olcott, W.T. 328
Oldenberg, H. 29 and n, 30n, 31, 33, 34n, 35, 36, 38 and n, 42–44, 51, 52n, 53, 54, 55n, 68, 92, 94 and n, 95n, 117, 119, 124, 127, 148, 197n, 199–200, 211, 213, 328, 336
Oldenburg, S. 113, 115
Oldham, C.F. 326, 336
Olesen, E. 209
Olson, C. 323n
Oltramare, 44, 46, 50, 49 and 52n, 133n
Oman, J.C. 7n, 210n, 227n
O' Malley, L.S.S. 6n
Ono, G. 112
Oppert, G. 3, 7n, 13, 14n, 295
Ortel, H. 45n
Osthoff, H. 49
Otani, 115
Otto, R. 218–19, 284
Oursel, P.M. 68, 102
Ovsyaniko–Kulikovsky, D. 32

Pa-Chow 129n, 153
Padfield, J.E. 7n
Page, J.A. 146
Pahadia, S.M. 145
Pal, B.C. 58, 59n, 206–07 and n
Pal, D.N. 312
Pal, P. 354, 363, 369
Pande, D.B. 360
Pande, G.C. 119 and n, 194, 215
Pande, K.C. 297, 301–02, 306
Pande, L.P. 362n
Pande, S. 281
Pandey, G.P. 361
Pandey, R.B. 258
Pandit, M.P. 78, 320
Pandit, S.P. 36, 63
Pansikkar, R. 89
Pantulu, M.B. 64
Paranjpe, V.G. 86
Pargiter, F. 232 and n, 233n
Parimoo, R. 339 n, 355
Parmar, B.M.S. 356
Patawardhan, R.V. 315n
Patel, N.J. 179n
Paterson, 18, 159, 166
Pathak, K.B. 173, 289, 319n, 326n
Pathak, P.Y. 63
Pathak, S.P. 237
Pathak, V.S. 289, 297, 303
Patil, D.R. 235, 237, 329
Patreia, A.K. 88
Pattabiramin, P.Z. 367
Patwardhan, M.V. 164n
Paul, P.L. 180n
Pauly, B. 113n

Pauthier, G. 46
Pavitrananda 243
Pavolini, P.E. 94n, 96, 165, 156n, 210n, 211
Pawate, S.D 302
Payne, E.A. 317
Peiper, C.R. 8, 211
Peiris, W. 92
Pelliot, P. 112 and n, 113 and n
Pelly, R.L. 64
Penna, F.R.D. 106–07
Peppe, W.C. 146
Pereira, J. 357
Perron, A. du 45 and n
Pertold, B. 176n
Peter, I.S. 229
Petroffsky, 115
Phillips, G.E. 300
Phattelalji 184n
Piggott, S. 14n
Pillai, G.S. 301
Pincott, 341n
Pisani, V. 209
Pischel, R. 29, 30n, 32, 94, 95n, 114n, 161, 167n, 328
Pitambara 65n
Playfair, A. 6n
Plott, J.C. 284n
Poley, L. 45n, 46, 272
Porzig, W. 210n
Possehl, G. 14n
Potdar, K.R. 81
Pott, P.H. 316, 319
Prabhavananda 216
Pradhan, P. 111n
Pranjoti, V. 301
Prasad, H.K. 357
Prau, J.B. 57 and n
Prem Krishna 219
Preston, J. 323
Prinsep, J. 109
Przyluski, J. 12 and n, 76, 105n, 117, 128 and n, 289, 316
Puini, C. 107
Pulle, L. 159, 167, 169n
Puran Giri 107
Purani, A.B. 77
Puri, B.N. 154
Pusalkar, A.D. 197n, 203–04, 209, 221, 227, 233n, 237, 258, 261–62
Puskar, I. 14n

Radhakrishnan, S. 37, 68, 69n, 70, 80, 178, 187, 214, 216, 265, 317
Radloff, W. 116
Raghavan, V. 221n, 257–58, 261
Raghuchandrachar, H.N. 259
Rahder, J. 101 and n
Rahula, T. 101n, 104, 136
Rahula, W. 152
Rai, D. 68n
Rai, S.N. 330
Rajagopalachariar, T. 287n
Rajeswari, D.R. 370
Raju, P.T. 259
Rajvade, C.V. 98n
Rajvade, V.K. 63, 98n
Rakshit, R.K. 7n
Ram, R. 154
Ramachandra, S.K. 360
Ramachandra, V.R. 65n
Ramachandran, T.N. 146n, 147 and n
Ramanujan, B.V. 281
Rama Sastri, V.V. 260
Rama Prasad 316n
Ramaswami Sastri, K.S. 229
Ramaswami Sastri, V.A. 258
Ramesan, N. 142n, 356
Ranade, R.D. 70–71, 221
Randle 103 and n
Rangachari, K. 7n
Rangacharya 259
Rao, B.S. 168
Rao, B.V.K. 178n
Rao, Gopinath 146, 166n
Rao, N. 20n
Rao, P.R.R. 353
Rao, S. 220
Rao, S.G. 178, 181
Rao, S.R. 146n
Rao, S. Subha 232n
Rao, T.A. Gopinatha 146, 166n, 287n, 326, 328, 332, 335, 343 and n, 344–45, 348, 351, 358–60, 364–65

Rao, V.K. 365n
Rapson, E.J. 234
Rask, R. 93
Ratnachandra, Muni 372
Ravivarma, L.A. 260
Rawson, P. 311n
Ray, A.P.C. 315
Ray, A.N. 222n
Ray, G.C. 327n, 368
Ray, H.C. 147
Ray, Niharranjan 23, 152, 255
Ray, P. 315n
Ray, P.C. 315n
Raychaudhuri, G.K. 7n
Raychaudhuri, H.C. 202–03, 207, 226, 258, 274, 286–87
Raychaudhuri, P.C. 185
Rea 146
Regamey, C. 12 and n, 120, 121, 125 and n
Regnaud, P. 30n, 46 and n, 50, 53
Regnier 31n
Reichlet, R. 116
Reischaur, E.O. 153
Rele, V.G. 218, 316
Remusat, A. 111, 117
Renan, E. 274
Rendel, P. 311n, 316
Renou, L. 30n, 34n, 71, 73, 81, 86, 120, 256, 264, 371
Rhys Davids, C.A.F. 92, 94n, 95 and n, 96, 125–27, 133, 149
Rhys Davids, T.W. 92, 94, 95 and n, 96, 97n, 117, 122, 133, 147n, 148, 228, 371
Rhins, D. de 113
Rice, B.L. 298
Rice, E.P. 182n
Rice, R. 227
Rieker, H.V. 316
Ridgeway 37
Ridding 114
Riemschneider, M. 76
Riew, B. 372
Risley, H.H. 6n, 11
Ritter 319
Rivers, W.H.R. 6n
Rixner, T.A. 45n
Robertson, C.S. 6n
Roer, H.H.E. 27n, 46
Roerich, G. 109, 154
Rose, H.A. 6n
Rosen, Friedrich 27
Roser, R.A. 6n
Roth, Rudolph 27, 28, 30n, 31n, 36, 79, 370–71, 373
Roy, Raja Rammohan 45, 57–59, 64
Roy, S.C. 6n, 12
Ruben, W. 204, 225–27, 289
Ruckert, F. 210n, 227n
Rudolf, O. 289
Russell, R.V. 6n
Ruyksbroeck, W. Van 106
Ryder, A.W. 215

Sadhala, G.S. 224
Saha, R.N. 329
Sahai, B. 326, 359, 367–69 and n
Sahasrabuddha 303
Sahityabhusan, K.N. 166
Sahni, D.R. 146n, 147
Sahu, L.N. 185
Sahu, N.K. 144
Saint, Hilaire B. 122
Sakhare, M.R. 302
Saletore, B.A. 181
Salisbury, E. 142n
Saloman, T.J. 284n
Samasramj, S. 95, 101
Sampurnanand 87
Samsukha, P.C. 185
Sandal, M.L. 64, 68 and n
Sandesara, B.J. 372
Sangave, V.A. 185
Sanghvi, S.L. 258
Sankalia, H.D. 19n, 20n, 21n, 203, 296, 350
Sankara, Y. 62
Sankrityayana, R. 98n, 104, 105n, 110, 136
Sannaya, B.S. 190
Saraswati, D. 58, 246
Śaraswati, S.K. 326, 354, 361, 365n
Saraswati, B. 90

Sardesai, S.G. 215, 223
Sarkar, A. 231
Sarkar, A.K. 135
Sarkar, B.K. 7n
Sarkar, H. 146 and n
Sarkar, K.C. 361
Sarkar, M.N. 258
Sarkisyanz, E. 152
Sarma, B.D. 64
Sarma, B.S. 63
Sarma, D.S. 219, 259
Sarma, P. 63
Sarma, S.N. 293
Sarma, S.S. 64
Sarma, L.R. 63
Saroja, G.V. 224
Sarup, L. 63
Sarva, S. 85n
Sasanananda, S. 144
Sastri, A.K. 259
Sastri, G.N. 85n
Sastri, H. 147, 314n
Sastri, H.K. 345, 359, 361
Sastri, H.P. 24, 100, 101, 102n, 103, 104n, 105 and n, 144, 308n, 313, 315
Sastri, K.S. 166n
Sastri, K.S.R. 105n
Sastri, K.V. 65n
Sastri, P.D. 68n
Sastri, R.A. 296
Sastri, R.K. 63
Sastri, S.B. 105n
Sastri, S.C. 101
Sastri, S.R. 65
Sastri, S.S. 14n, 182n
Sastri, Subrahmanya 65n
Sastri, S.V. 65
Sastri, T.G. 105
Sastri, V.B.V. 63
Sastri, V.L.P. 65n
Sastri, V.S. 315
Saunders, E.D. 317, 319
Saunders, K.S. 94n
Schayer, St. 125 and n, 133 and n
Schelling 31, 91
Scherman, L. 36, 39, 47
Schiefner, A. 109, 110, 121, 127
Schlegel, A.W. Von 28, 210 and n
Schlingloff 114
Schmidt, I.G. 108 and n, 120
Schmidt, P.W. 2, 10, 12
Schmidt, R. 101n, 167
Schoebel 122
Schomerus, H.W. 54n
Schopenhauer 46, 49, 50n, 52
Schrader, O. 55
Schrader, F.O. 97n, 171, 173, 212, 215, 219, 285
Scrafton, L. 240n
Schroeder, F.C.G. 107
Schroeder, L.V. 30n, 31, 35, 41, 42, 48, 55, 73, 94n, 197n, 211, 220
Schübring, W. 161, 162 and n, 163 and n, 164, 173n, 180, 372
Schultz, F.A. 297
Schuman, L. 39
Schumann, W.W. 93n
Schwab, J. 55
Seagal, L. 215
Seckel, D. 353
Seidenstücker, K. 95n, 96 and n, 165
Sen, A. 334, 337
Sen, A.C. 163 and n, 173, 180
Sen, D.C. 229
Sen, K.M. 260
Sen, M. 191
Sen, N.M. 258
Sen, S. 260
Senart, E. 46n, 100, 119, 120, 123, 127, 288, 269
Sengupta, R. 145n, 356
Sen Majumdar, G. 144n
Senzaki, N. 154
Seshadri, M. 20n
Seth, H.D. 170, 372
Seth, H.G. Das 372
Seth, N. 294
Settar, S. 190n, 193, 339, 356
Sewell, R. 146, 341n, 342
Shah, A.P. 184n
Shah, C.J. 180
Shah, J.N. 135n
Shah, N.J. 189, 192, 193

Shah, U.P. 182, 188, 194, 317n, 326, 355, 358–59
Shahidullah, M. 105n
Shakespear, J. 6n
Shakespear, L.W. 144
Shaku, S. 154
Shamrao, T.S. 190
Shamasastry, R. 63, 163, 184
Shanta, N. 89
Sharma, A. 215, 224, 284n
Sharma, B.N. 356, 358, 365, 367, 369
Sharma, B.R. 332n
Sharma, B.N.K. 260
Sharma, C.D. 135n
Sharma, D.S. 255, 261n
Sharma, H.M. 166
Sharma, J.K. 365
Sharma, K. 283
Sharma, M.R. 279
Sharma, R.C. 357
Sharma, R.N. 84n
Sharma, R.S. 151, 223n, 280
Sharma, S.L. 141
Sharma, S.R. 181
Sharma, V.D. 64
Shastri, D. 234
Shastri, D.R. 259
Shastri, J.L. 239
Shastri, H.P. 227n, 233
Shastri, N.A. 258
Shende, N.J. 81, 329
Sheridan, D.P. 294
Sheth, G.B. 185
Sheth, H.D. 170
Shore, F.J. 3n
Shrimali, K.M. 339n
Shriyan, R. 189
Shukla, D.N. 359
Siddhanta, N.K. 207
Siddhantasastri, R.K. 299, 305
Siddhatissa, H. 136
Sikdar, J.C. 188
Silabhadra, Bhiksu 98n
Silva, C.L.A. de 134
Simon, R. 41, 55n
Simpson, W.G. 240n, 319n
Simson, W. 145
Singer, M. 294
Singh, C. 64–65
Singh, O.P. 360
Singh, K. 192
Singh, R.B.P. 190
Singh, S.B. 360
Singh, T. 260
Singhvi, S. 183, 187, 192
Sinha, A.K. 357
Sinha, B.C. 338 and n
Sinha, J.N. 263, 300, 302, 306
Sinha, Kanchan 331, 367
Sinha, P.N. 232
Sircar, D.C. 35n, 259, 262, 280, 314n, 319, 327n, 334n, 339
Sircar, M.N. 218, 258–59
Siri Sivali, B. 97
Sirur, B.V. 191
Sister Nivedita, 243n, 352, 358, 365, 368
Sital Prasad 184n
Sivaramamurti, C. 327n
Sivapadasundaram, K. 300
Sivaraman, K. 306
Skorupksi, T. 144n
Sluszkeiwicz, E. 229
Smith, D.E. 152
Smith, H. 95n, 120, 371
Smith, V.A. 3, 118n, 146, 233, 328n, 342 and n, 349
Snellgrove, D. 106, 127n, 140, 145n, 155, 354
Sogani, K.C. 189
Sogen, Y. 128, 133 and n
Soli, S.B.P. 238, 294
Sompura, P.O. 360
Sonja, J. 99 and n
Sontake 77
Soothill, W.E. 112
Sörensen, S. 197n, 209
Sounders, D.D. 353
Sovani, V.V. 288
Soyaza, A.P. de 97
Speir, C. 46
Spence Hardy, R. 121, 133
Spencer, G.W. 339
Spencer, Herbert 7
Speyer, J.S. 50n, 53, 101 and n

Spiegel, J. 34n, 94 and n
Spinoza 91
Spiro, M.E. 152
Spooner, D.B. 145–47, 328
Spratt, Philip 81
Srinivas, M.N. 24 and n
Srinivasan, D. 14n, 89
Srinivasan, K.R. 264
Srinivasan, M.M. 24 and n
Srinivasan, P.R. 144
Srinivasan, T.M. 359
Srinivasachari, P.N. 218, 258
Srinivasacharya, L. 63
Srinivasa Sastri, V.S. 230
Srivastava, Balaram 369
Srivastava, M.C.P. 369
Srivastava, V.C. 330, 362
Srivastava, V.N. 356
Staal, F. 85
Stack, E. 7n
Stael-Holstein, 102, 111n, 115
Stcherbatsky, Th. 92, 102, 103n, 109, 111n, 117–18, 126 and n, 127, 132, 133 and n, 134, 136, 373
Stede, W. 95n, 371
Steinthal, P. 95n, 163 and n
Stevenson, B. 332
Stevenson, J. 40, 158n, 159
Stevenson, S. 172, 174, 180n
Stein, M.A. 18 and n, 113, 114–15 and n, 146
Stein, R.A. 154
Stönner, H. 115n, 116
Strauss, O. 54n, 68, 197n, 211
Straubel, C. 47n
Strong, D.M. 96
Stuart, H.A. 6n
Stuart-Fox, M. 157
Stuttenheim, W. 230
Suali, L. 169 and n, 177n
Subbhiah, A.V. 298
Subha Reddy, D.V. 315
Subramaniyam, K.R. 146 and n
Subramanian, K.R. 300
Sukthankar, V.S. 67, 203, 205n, 209, 217n, 226
Sullivan, H.P. 14n
Sumangala Thera, 95n
Sunavala, A.J. 179n
Sunim, S. 153
Suri, V.R. 372
Suryanarayan Sastri, S.S. 301
Sutariya, J. 63
Suziyama, 112, 372
Suzuki, B.L. 131n
Suzuki, D.T. 101, 132n, 152, 154
Swami, P. 215
Swami, S. 220–21
Svamin, Govindacharya 288
Swamy, H.T. 303n
Tadpatrikar 204
Tagore, D.N. 57
Tagore, G.V. 239
Tagore, J. 217n
Tagore, R.N. 58, 66n, 70, 205–06, 265–66
Tajima 111n
Takakusu, J. 95n, 98, 112, 134, 372
Taki, S. 316
Talbot, M.C. 145
Tandon, Y. 236
Tank, U.S. 174
Tarkabhusan, P.N. 259
Tarkalankara, C. 63
Tarkaratna, P. 309–10
Tarkaratna, T.C. 63
Tarkavacaspati, T.N. 62n
Tatacharya, A.S. 65n
Tatia, N. 185, 188, 192
Tattvabhusan, S. 68n
Tauler, C.H. 53, 197n
Tawney, C.H. 166n, 197n
Taylor, A.C. 95n
Teignmouth, 241n
Telang, K.T. 210–11, 214, 227 and n
Teramoto, E. 110
Terra, H. de 18
Tessitory, L.P. 167
Tewari, S.P. 360
Thadani, N.V. 202, 219
Thakur, A. 104
Thakur, U. 144, 188, 367n
Thakur, V.K. 223n

Thapar, D.R. 359
Thapar, R. 3n, 215
Thibaut, G. 53, 163
Thieme, P. 76, 88
Thisiwal, A.C. 64–65
Thite, U. 85
Thomas, E.J. 29n, 95n, 123, 215
Thomas, F.W. 111n, 115, 174, 179n
Thomas, P. 4n, 311n
Thomson, G. 23n, 151, 320
Thomson, J.C. 210
Thurston, E. 7n
Tiele, C.P. 274
Tilak, B.G. 66, 214–17 and n, 218, 220, 224
Tin, P.M. 97
Tiwari, A.R.C. 295n
Tiwari, J.N. 323
Tiwari, M.N.P. 357–58
Tolman 47
Trask, W.R. 311n, 316
Trenckner, V. 94, 95n, 97n
Tripathi, C.L. 135
Tripathi, G.C. 293
Trivedi, R.D. 369
Trivedi, R.S. 67
Trungpa, C. 155
Tsuzi, Z. 153
Tucci, G. 102 and n, 103 and n, 109, 110, 133, 140 and n, 154, 311 and n, 317, 319, 353
Tukol, T.K. 193
Turner, G. 94, 218n, 371
Tuxen, P. 255 and n
Tylor, E.B. 2n, 7, 8n
Tyomokin, E.M. 115n, 116n

Udgikar, N.B. 288
Ui, H. 111n
Underhill, M.M. 7n
Upadhyaya, B.D. 135n
Upadhyaya, B.S. 98n
Upadhyaya, K.M. 135n, 215, 223
Upadhyaya, S.C. 357
Upadhye, A.N. 167n, 194
Urquhart, W.S. 54n

Vadekar, D.D. 218
Vaidya, C.V. 197n, 207
Vaidya, P.L. 101n, 102n, 103n, 162n, 163, 167n, 184, 220, 227–28, 258
Vaidyanatha, M. 63
Vallee Poussin, 50n, 92, 95n, 100n, 101n, 103 and n, 104, 111n, 114 and n, 117, 118 and n, 125, 128, 129, 132, 133 and n
Van Gulik, K.H. 313
Van Kooij, K.R. 320
Varenne, J. 86
Varma, S. 1n
Vasilev, V.P. 109, 122, 125, 127, 132, 133, 135, 373
Vasu, Srisa Chandra 64–65
Vasu, N.N. 144, 147
Vaswani, T.L. 207
Vats, M.S. 14n, 361
Vedāntavāgīśa, A. 42n, 62
Velankar, H.D. 160, 167n, 169
Venkatachari, K.K.A. 363
Venkatacharya, C. 329
Venkatakrishnaiya, R.S. 64
Venkataramanan, K. 135
Venkataraman, K.R. 259–60, 272
Venkataramanayya, N. 295n
Venkatarama Sastri, T.R. 226, 258
Venkatarao, A. 184
Venkataswami, M.N. 227
Venkateswara, S.V. 175n, 360
Venkateswaran, C.S. 258
Venkatasubramania, S. 239
Verma, B.S. 20n
Verma, I. 1n
Verma, V.P. 151
Vesci, U.M. 85
Vidyabhusan, A.C. 165, 326, 369n
Vidyabhusan, H. 42n
Vidyabhusana, S.C. 136, 168, 172n, 177 and n
Vidyabinod, B.B. 114n, 349
Vidyarnava, S.C. 64, 309, 317, 318n
Vidyarthi, L.P. 339n
Vidyasagara, I.C. 62n
Vidyasagara, J. 42n, 62 and n, 65n
Vijay, R. 166n

Vijayalakshmy, R. 195
Vira, R. 79–80, 316, 355
Viraraghava, K.C. 315
Visvabandhu 370
Vivekananda 67, 216
Vogel, J.Ph. 145 and n, 147, 328n, 337, 342, 349n
Vorobyov-Desyatovsky, 116 and n
Vostrikov, A.I. 106
Vries, J.D.L. de 234
Vyas, R.N. 280
Vyas, S.N. 230
Vyasanga, M. 190n

Wackernagel, J. 37n
Waddell, L.A. 109, 137, 147, 314, 342
Wagiswara, S.D.L. 94n
Wagle, N. 150–51
Waldschmidt, E. 113n, 114, 120
Walleser, M. 50n, 95n, 102, 111n, 129, 133 and n
Wallis, H.W. 35–36, 87
Wanchipe, R.S. 145n
Ward, M.F. 353
Ward, W. 4 and n, 241
Warder, A.K. 95n, 131, 143
Warren, H. 97, 174, 176
Warren, S. 160, 162
Watters, T. 111n, 130, 131
Wayman, Alex, 139–41
Weber, A. 31n, 37, 41, 42n, 45n, 46, 49, 55 and n, 60, 159–63, 165–66, 167, 197n, 199, 214, 220, 227–28, 250, 272–74, 276–77, 288, 295, 372
Weber, Max 8, 257
Weil, K.E. 152
Welch, W. 153
Weller, F. 101n, 115n
Wesdin, J.Ph. 93 and n
Westergaard, N.L. 94
Westermarck, E. 2n
Wheeler, M. 14n, 20n
Whitehead, H. 62
Whitney, W.D. 29, 30n, 35, 36, 37, 43–44, 47, 48
Widurapola 97
Wijisekera 152
Wijisimha, L.C. 97
Wilford 241
Wilkins, C. 210, 240n, 241 and n
Wilkins, W.J. 200, 242 and n, 326
William, R. 188
Wilson, H.H. 28n, 122, 158–59, 231 and n, 241, 264, 271–72, 274, 307n, 360, 371, 373
Windisch, E. 30n, 92, 95n, 119, 160n, 167, 231n
Windischmann, C.J.H. 45–46
Winternitz, M. 29, 38, 41, 43, 49, 53–55, 57n, 75, 79, 99, 118, 162, 196, 197n, 199, 209, 210n, 212–13, 210, 226, 228–33, 332, 336
Wogihara, 101n, 102n, 103
Wood, J.H. 316n
Woods 95n
Woodroffe, J. 309 and n, 310 and n, 313, 317, 320, 373
Woodward, F.L. 95n, 96 and n, 98, 99, 371
Wrigging, W.H. 152
Wright, A.F. 153
Wulff, D. 323n
Wurm, P. 30n, 295

Yadava, B.R. 87
Yajnika, N.D. 184
Yamada 113n
Yamamoto, C. 229
Yamunacharya, M. 222n, 329
Yamunachariar, M. 263
Yasodadevi, V. 369n
Yazdani, G. 145n
Yuyama, A. 115n, 120

Zachariae, Th. 27n, 167, 371
Zaehner, R.C. 215, 223, 265–66
Zimmer, H. 8n, 316, 337
Zürcher, E. 153
Zvelebil, K. 331n, 339